9-30 A.M.

SPECIAL MOTION RE. BOMBAY AND MYSORE BORDER ADJUSTMENTS.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಕೆ. ವೀರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ (ಮದ್ದೂರು).— ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಸಭಾಪತಿಗಳೇ, ಈ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಕಂಡ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಮಂಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆಯನ್ನು ಬೇಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಇಂಗ್ಲೀಷಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇರುವುದನ್ನು ಓದಿ ಅನಂತರ ಕನ್ನಡದಲ್ಲಿ ಅದರ ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನು ವಿವರಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಇದೆ :—

"(1) This Assembly earnestly requests the Government of India to reaffirm that the boundaries settled by Parliament under the States Reorganisation Act of 1956 should not be disturbed in the interest of unity and integrity of India and her national development except for minor adjustments agreed to by the States concerned.

(2) This Assembly expresses its great concern at the repeated attempts made by certain elements from outside the State to foment trouble among the people of the Mysore-Bombay border area by continued unhealthy propaganda and consequent breaches of law and order.

(3) This Assembly records its appreciation of the stand taken by the people of that are a in not encouraging such unlawful activities.

(4) And this Assembly, while supporting the stand and steps taken by the Government of Mysore, calls upon the agitators to abandon such objectionable activities which are likely to create disaffection amongst the people of the said area."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

"(1) This Assembly earnestly requests the Government of India to reaffirm that the boundaries settled by Parliament under the States Reorganisation Act of 1956 should not be disturbed in the interest of unity and integrity of India and her national development except for minor adjustments agreed to by the States concerned.

(2) This Assembly expresses its great concern at the repeated attempts made by certain elements from outside the State to foment trouble among the people of the Mysore-Bombay border area by continued unhealthy propaganda and consequent breaches of law and order.

(3) This Assembly records its appreciation of the stand taken by the people of that area in not encouraging such unlawful activities.

(4) And this Assembly, while supporting the stand and steps taken by the Government of Mysore, calls upon the agitators to abandon such objectionable activities which are likely to create disaffection amongst the people of the said area."

There are a number of amendments. I now request members one by one to move. The first is by Sri V. S. Patil.

Sri V. S. PATIL (Belgaum-I).—I beg to move the following amendments :

'(1) In clause (1), for the words "minor adjustment agreed to by the States concerned", the words "readjusting the boundaries on the basis of linguistic majority, contiguity taking village as a unit and wishes of the people expressed through democratic ways."

(2) Clause (2) shall be deleted.

(3) The word "such" occurring in line (2) of clause (3) shall be deleted.

(4) For clause (4), the following shall be substituted :—

"and that this Assembly requests the Government to take immediate steps to meet the legitimate demand of the Marathi speaking people in the border areas between Mysore and Bombay States by conceding to allow these areas to be integrated with the Bombay State." '

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

'(1) In clause (1), for the words "minor adjustment agreed to by the States concerned", the words "readjusting the boundaries on the basis of linguistic majority, contiguity taking village as a unit and wishes of the people expressed through democratic ways".

(2) Clause (2) shall be deleted.

(3) The word "such" occurring in line (2) of clause (3) shall be deleted.

(4) For clause (4), the following shall be substituted :

"and that this Assembly requests the Government to take immediate steps to meet the legitimate demand of the Marathi speaking people in the border areas between Mysore and Bombay States by conceding to allow these areas to be integrated with the Bombay State."'

The next one is in the name of Sri Narasimhan.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN (Kolar Gold Fields).—I beg to move :

'For clause (1) the following words shall be substituted :

"This Assembly earnestly requests the Government of India to reaffirm that the boundaries settled by Parliament nnder the States Reorganization Act of 1956, in respect of Mysore should by and large be considered final except for border adjustmants between the Mysore and neighbouring States on the basis of administrative and economic convenience, language and culture, etc., and to be determined by a suitable boundary commission or boundary commissions appointed by the Government of India after consultations."'

'For clauses (2) and (3) the following words shall be substituted :

"This Assembly expresses its great concern at the deteriorating law and order situation in Mysore —Bombay border and calls upon the people to remain calm, be restrained and not get provoked into violent activities."'

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

'For clause (1) the following words shall be substituted :

"The Assembly earnestly requests the Government of India to reaffirm that the boundaries settled by Parliament under the States Reorganisation Act of 1956, in respect of Mysore should by and large be considered final except for border adjustments between the Mysore and neighbouring States on the bassis of administrative and economic convenience, language and culture, etc., and to be determined by a suitable boundaiy commission or boundary commissions appointed by the Government of India after consultations".'

'For Clauses (2) and (3) the following words shall be substituted :

"This Assembly expresses its great concern at the deteriorating law and order situation in Mysore —Bombay border and calls upon the people to remain calm, be restrained and not get provoked into violent activities".'

Sri K. KENCHAPPA (Hiriyur).—I am not moving my amendment.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA (Mangalore-I).—Sir, I beg to move :

After the word "boundaries" in line 2, add "between Bombay State and Mysore State".

Mr. SPEAKER.–Amendment moved :

After the word "boundaries" in line 2, add "between Bombay State and Mysore State."

Before I call upon the mover of the motion to speak, I will draw the

attention of the Hon'ble Members to rule 140 which is as follows:

> "No speech on a resolution shall, except with the permission of the Speaker, exceed fifteen minutes in duration:
>
> Provided that the mover of a resolution, when moving the same and the Minister concerned when speaking for the first time, may speak for thirty minutes or for such longer time as the Speaker may permit."

I also want to draw the attention of the Hon'ble Members to rule 152 which says:

> "The Speaker may, if he thinks fit, prescribe a time limit for speeches."

Sri M. C NARASIMHAN.—Is it not a motion under rule 146?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yes.

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY (Coondapur).—I suggest that if there are too many speakers, the Speaker may put a time limit but if there are not too many members sufficient time may be given to the members on this side at least to voice their opinion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I shall give half an hour each to the mover of the motion and the Minister concerned and 15 minutes to members.

Sri M.C. NARASIMHAN.—I want te explain that the motion itself is inadmissible.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If you say that the motion itself is inadmissible, then you could not have moved an amendment,

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—My amendment as well as Sri Baliga's amendment are in order because they come within the purview of the rules.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If the main motion is out of order, how can the amendment be in order?

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—If my amendment is out of order to that extent I am prepared to withdraw it. How can we do a thing which is contrary to the rules?

Mr. SPEAKER.—You cannot say that.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAM.—I did not know the exact procedure you wanted to follow in respect of this matter. I thought it was my duty to point out that it was not in order. To the extent it is not in order should I not be heard?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have already made the position clear. I now call upon the mover of the motion to speak.

(Sri H. K. Veeranna Goudh began to speak in Kannada).

Sri V. S. PATIL.—We cannot follow what the Hon'ble Member speaks. Let him speak in English.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಕೆ. ವೀರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಕನ್ನಡದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹ ಮುದ್ರಿಸಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಹಂಚಲಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಭಾವಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ವಿವರವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಲು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಿಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲ (ಶ್ರೀ ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯರು ಮತ್ತು ಇತರ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೆ ತಮಗೆ ಕನ್ನಡ ಕಾಪಿ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಸೂಚಿಸಿದರು).

ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಅಂಶಗಳು ಅಡಕವಾಗಿವೆ. ಮೊದಲನೆಯ ಅಂಶ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಗಳ ಪುನರ್ವಿಂಗಡಣಾ ಕಾನೂನೇನು 1956ನೆಯ ಇಸವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಗೀಕಾರವಾಗಿರುವುದಿದೆ ಅದರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನಿರ್ಧಾರವಾಗಿರುವ ಗಡಿಯನ್ನು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಕೂಡದು, ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಗಳು ಒಪ್ಪಿದರೆ ಅಲ್ಪಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಸಣ್ಣಪುಟ್ಟ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರಬೇಕು. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಇದನ್ನು ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಪೂರ್ವಕವಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿಯಪಡಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದು ಮೊದಲನೆಯ ಅಂಶವಾಗಿದೆ.

ಎರಡನೆಯದು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮೂಲ ಕಾರಣ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಅದೇನೆಂದರೆ ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ಮೈಸೂರು ಮತ್ತು ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಈ ಎರಡು ಪ್ರಾಂತಗಳ ಗಡಿ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಗಲಭೆ, ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಜನರು ಗಡಿ ನಾಡಿನ ಪ್ರದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯತೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ಜನಜೀವನಕ್ಕೆ, ಶಿಸ್ತಿಗೆ ಧಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುವಂತೆ ನಡೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಕಳವಳವನ್ನುಂಟುಮಾಡಿದೆ ಎಂಬ ಅಂಶ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡಕವಾಗಿದೆ. ಗಡಿನಾಡಿನ ಪ್ರದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊರನಾಡಿನ ನಮ್ಮ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಡದಿರುವ ಜನರು ಬಂದು ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ಜನರನ್ನು ಪ್ರಚೋದನೆಗೊಳಿಸಿ ಗಲಭೆ, ಅಶಾಂತಿ ಉಂಟಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಅದನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯವರು ಕಳವಳದಿಂದ ನೋಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸಿದೆ.

ಮೂರನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಹೊರಗಿನವರು ಏನೇ ಪ್ರಚೋದನೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೂ ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ಜನರು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಶಾಂತಿಯಿಂದ ನಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೊರಗಡೆಯವರ ಮಾತಿಗೆ ಕಿವಿಗೊಡದೆ, ಪ್ರೋತ್ಸಾಹ ಕೊಡದೆ ಶಾಂತಿ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಕೆ. ವೀರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ)

ಯಿಂದ ಕೂಡಿ ಕಾನೂನಿಗೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿ ನಡೆದು ಕೊಳ್ಳದಿರುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯವರು ಮೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಕಡೆಯದಾಗಿ, ಇದುವರೆಗೆ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ಸಂಬಂಧವಾಗಿ ಏನೊಂದು ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೋ, ಏನೊಂದು ನಿಲುವನ್ನು ತಾಳಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಸಭೆ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತಾ ಈ ಚಳವಳಿಯನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಿರುವ ಜನರು ಇಲ್ಲದ ಸಲ್ಲದ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸಬಾರದೆಂಬ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆಯು ಸೂಚಿತವಾಗಿದೆ.

ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯಕ್ಕೆ ಅಗತ್ಯವೇನಿತ್ತೆನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಎರಡು ಮಾತಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಮತ್ತು ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಗಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅನಿಷ್ಟವಾದಂಥ ಪ್ರಚಾರ ಮತ್ತು ಚಳವಳಿ ನಡೆದು, ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ಜನರ ಶಾಂತಿಗೆ ಭಂಗ ಉಂಟಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥಾದ್ದು ಹೊಸದೇನೂ ಅಲ್ಲ. ಹಾಗೂ ಅದು ನಾನಾರೂಪವನ್ನು ತಾಳಿದೆ. ಸತ್ಯಾಗ್ರಹರೂಪ, ಕಂದಾಯ ನಿರಾಕರಣೆ ಚಳವಳಿ ಮತ್ತು ಗಲಾಟೆ, ದಾಂಧಲೆ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ನಾನಾ ರೂಪವನ್ನು ತಾಳಿದೆ. ಇದು ಆ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದವರಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ನೋಡಿದವರಿಗೆ ಕಳವಳವನ್ನು ತರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಅಂಶವಾಗಿದೆ, ಈ ಕಾರಣದಿಂದ ಇದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ತೋರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯದ ಅಗತ್ಯ ಉಂಟಾಗಿದೆ.

ತಾತ್ವಿಕವಾಗಿ ಈ ಗಡಿನಾಡಿನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಎಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಉದ್ಭವಿಸಲೇಬಾರದು, ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ನಾವು ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥವರು, ಏನೂ ಸಂಬಂಧವಿಲ್ಲದವರು, ನಾವು ಸರ್ವ ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರರು, ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮ ಗಡಿಯನ್ನು ಇನ್ನಷ್ಟು ಅಗಲ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು, ಇನ್ನಷ್ಟು ದೊಡ್ಡದು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಒಬ್ಬರಿಗಿಂತ ಇನ್ನೊಬ್ಬರು ದೊಡ್ಡವರು ಎಂದು ಎನ್ನಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ಎಂಬ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸತಕ್ಕದಲ್ಲ. ಹಿಮಾಚಲದಿಂದ ಕನ್ಯಾಕುಮಾರಿಯವರೆಗೆ ಇಡೀ ಭಾರತ ಒಂದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಆಡಳಿತಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ನಾನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಮಾತು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದು ಉತ್ಪ್ರೇಕ್ಷೆಯಾಗಲಾರದೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ರಾಮಾಯಣ, ಮಹಾಭಾರತದ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹ ಭಾರತ ದೇಶ ಏಕಚಕ್ರಾಧಿಪತ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿರಲ್ಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದರೆ ಅದು ಉತ್ಪ್ರೇಕ್ಷೆಯ ಮಾತಲ್ಲ. ಪುರಾಣಗಳಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಚಪ್ಪನ್ನಾರ್ (6) ದೇಶವೆಂದು ಉತ್ತರದಲ್ಲಿತ್ತು. ಈಗ ಭಾರತ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿರುವುದು ಒಂದೇ ಒಂದು ಆಡಳಿತ; ಅದು ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದ ಆಡಳಿತ. ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ಈ ಗಡಿಗಳ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಏನು ? ಭಾರತದ ನಾಯಕರು, ಇದು ಒಂದು ಖಂಡ, ಒಂದು ಸಣ್ಣ ದೇಶವಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಷ್ಟು ದೊಡ್ಡದು ಭಾರತದೇಶ ಇದರ ಆಡಳಿತ ಸುಲಲಿತವಾಗಿ, ದಕ್ಷತೆಯಿಂದ ನಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ, ಆಡಳಿತದ ಅನುಕೂಲಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರವಾಗಿ, ಆಯಾ ಭಾಗಗಳನ್ನು ವಿಂಗಡಣೆ ಮಾಡಿ, ಈ ರೀತಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಗಳನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿದೆ. ಜನಗಳ ಅನುಕೂಲಕ್ಕೆ, ಸೌಕರ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ತಕ್ಕ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ, ಶಾಂತಿಭಂಗ ಬಾರದೆ ಇರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಯೇ ಆಡಳಿತ. ಅದನ್ನು ಇಡೀ ಭಾರತದಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಾ ಒಂದು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ನಡೆಸುವುದಾದರೆ, ಭಾರತ ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ವಿಸ್ತಾರವಾದ ಪ್ರದೇಶವಾದದ್ದರಿಂದ, ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗಬಹುದು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ವಿಂಗಡಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ಆಯಾ ಪ್ರದೇಶದ ಭಾಗಗಳಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಸರ್ಕಾರಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನ ಸರ್ಕಾರವೆಂದು ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಆಡಳಿತ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಮಾಡುವುದರಿಂದ, ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಸೌಕರ್ಯ, ಸೇವೆ, ತೊಂದರೆಗಳ ಪರಿಹಾರ, ಶಾಂತಿಯಿಂದ ಜೀವನ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ವಾತಾವರಣ, ಮುಂತಾದುವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಲು ಅನುಕೂಲ ಎಂಬ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಗಳನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಗಳನ್ನು ಏರ್ಪಾಡು ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಒಂದು ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಗಮನದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಸರ್ವೇಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಿ, ನಡೆನುಡಿ, ಆಚಾರ ವ್ಯವಹಾರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸಮಾನವಾಗಿರುವ ಒಂದು ಗುಂಪಿನವರಿಗೆ ಒಂದೊಂದು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನವಿರಲಿ ಎಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಹೀಗೆಂದ ಮಾತ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಆಚಾರವ್ಯವಹಾರ, ನಡೆ, ನುಡಿ, ಇವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಗುಂಪಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದವರೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಒಂದೇ ಆಡಳಿತಕ್ಕೆ ಒಳಪಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದು ಭಾಷೆಯನ್ನಾಡುವ ಎಲ್ಲ ಜನರೂ ಒಂದೇ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಆಡಳಿತದಲ್ಲಿರುವುದು ಸಾಧ್ಯವೂ ಅಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದಲೇ ಮರಾಠಿ ಜನರು, ಗುಜಾರಾಥಿ ಜನರು, ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ಭಾಷೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾತನಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಜನರು ಕನ್ನಡ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಭಾರತದೇಶ ದೊಡ್ಡದಾದ್ದರಿಂದ ಖಂಡ ಸ್ವರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಬೇರೆಬೇರೆ ಪ್ರಾಂತ್ಯದ ಜನರು ಬೇರೆಬೇರೆ ಪ್ರಾಂತ್ಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಇರುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡದೆ ಹೋದಲ್ಲಿ ವ್ಯವಹಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. '' Unity in diversity '' ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವ ಹಾಗೆ, ಹೊರಗಡೆಯಿಂದ ಭಾರತದ ವಿವಿಧ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅಲ್ಪಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಭಿನ್ನತೆ ಲಕ್ಷಣಗಳು ಕಂಡುಬಂದರೂ, ಒಂದು ಏಕತೆ ಭಾರತದಲ್ಲಿದೆ. ಆಡಳಿತದ ಅನುಕೂಲಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಹೀಗೆ ನಾವು ವಿಂಗಡಿಸಿರುವಾಗ, ನಾವು ಆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಕೆಳಗಿರಬಹುದು, ಈ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಕೆಳಗಿರಬಹುದು. ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ ಈ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಧೀನಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುವದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹಠ ಹಿಡಿಯತಕ್ಕಂಥಾದ್ದು ಅರ್ಥವಿಲ್ಲದ ಮಾತು. ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಆಡಳಿತ ಒಂದೇ, ಅದು ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಆಡಳಿತ. ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಒಂದು ಚೌಕಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ನಮ್ಮ ಸ್ಥಳದ ಅನುಕೂಲಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾರ್ಪಾಟು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು, ಆ ಚೌಕಟ್ಟನ್ನು ಮೀರದೆ ಆಡಳಿತ ನಡೆಸುವಂಥಾದ್ದು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಗಳ ಆದ್ಯ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ. ನಾವು ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಇರುತ್ತೇವೆ, ಮದರಾಸ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಇರುತ್ತೇವೆ, ಮೈಸೂರು ಸರ್ಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಇರುತ್ತೇವೆ, ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹಟ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಒಂದೇ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಆಡಳಿತದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಭಾಷೆಯನ್ನಾಡುವ ಜನರೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಇರುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಕನ್ನಡ ಮಾತನಾಡುವವರೇ ಇದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ ಎಂದರೆ, ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಶೇಕಡ 30 ರಷ್ಟು ತೆಲುಗು ಮಾತನಾಡುವವರಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಭಾಷೆಗಳನ್ನೂ ಮಾತನಾಡುವ ಜನರು ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಕೆಲವು ಮರಾಠಿ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗಿ ಹೋಗಿದೆ, ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟ ಎಂದು ಮನೋಭಾವ ತಾಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ಒಪ್ಪತಕ್ಕುದಲ್ಲ,

ನ್ಯಾಯವಾದುದೂಅಲ್ಲ. ದುರದೃಷ್ಟವಶಾತ್, ಇವತ್ತು ಈ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಿದೆ. ತಾತ್ವಿಕವಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಾದರೆ ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾದಂಥ ಒಂದು ಚಳವಳಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ.

ಎರಡನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ವಿಮರ್ಶೆ ಮಾಡೋಣ. ನಾನು ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯದ ಅಗತ್ಯವೇನೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈ ಗಡಿ ಪ್ರದೇಶದ ಒಂದು ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯು ಕಾರಣ, ಅದರ ಉದ್ದೇಶವೇನೆಂದು ವಿಮರ್ಶೆಮಾಡಿ ನೋಡಿದರೆ, ಅದು ಎಷ್ಟರ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ನ್ಯಾಯವೆನ್ನುವುದು ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ತಾವು ಅರ್ಧ ಘಂಟೆ ಕಾಲವನ್ನು ನನಗೆ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಕೊಡಿಸಿದ್ದೀರಿ; ಅದೂ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಅನೇಕ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಮಾತನಾಡುವವರು ಇದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದು ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಲಂಬಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟಪಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಸ್ಥೂಲವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಮರಾಠಿ ಭಾಷೆಯನ್ನಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ನಮ್ಮ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಬೆಳಗಾಂ ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿಗೆ ಸೇರಬೇಕೆನ್ನುವುದು ಎಷ್ಟರ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ನ್ಯಾಯವಾದುದು—ಇದು ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ—ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ವಿಮರ್ಶೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಮುವತ್ತು ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಗಿಂತ ಹಿಂದೆಯೇ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಸಭೆ ಸೇರಿದಾಗ ಆಗಿನ ನಾಯಕರಾಗಿದ್ದ ಶ್ರೀ ಕೇಳ್ಕರ್ ಅಂಥವರೂ ಕೂಡ ಬೆಳಗಾಂ ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿದ್ದು ಎಂದು ಘಂಟಾಘೋಷವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಸ್ಥಳದ ಅನುಕೂಲಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಇಲ್ಲಿ (ಬೆಳಗಾವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ) ನಾವು ಮರಾಠಿ ಸಾಹಿತ್ಯ ಸಮ್ಮೇಳನವನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೇವೆಂದು ಸಾರಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇವೊತ್ತು ನನಗೆ ಒಂದು ತಂತಿ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಇದು ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಆದಂಥಾದ್ದಲ್ಲ. 1929 ನೆಯ ಇಸವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ, ಒಪ್ಪಂದ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಎರಡು ಕಡೆ ಜನ ಸೇರಿದ್ದರು—ಕನ್ನಡ ಮಾತನಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ನಾಯಕರು, ಮತ್ತು ಮರಾಠಿ ಮಾತನಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ನಾಯಕರು ಒಂದು ಕಡೆ ಸೇರಿ ಈ ಒಪ್ಪಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ತಂತಿ ಹೀಗಿದೆ:

"Under the Presidentship of late Sri N. C. Kelkar of Poona the Marathi Literary Conference met at Belgaum on 29th May 1929 and passed in a clear and unequivocal language the following resolution that Belgaum District is recognised as a part of Karnatak province culturally and linguistically. Belgaum District has been so long and is at present a District in the Karnatak Province a fact borne out both by the British Government treating the Belgaum District as an Administrative unit and by the Congress including in it by the common consent of both Maharashtra and Karnatak people within the territorial jurisdiction of Karnatak Provincial Congress Committee. This above statement is further supported by late Prof. Shivaram Mahadev Paranjape, the then President of Maharashtra Sahitya Sammelan held at Belgaum on 29th May 1925 and other 16 signatories in that Conference notably late Shri Datta Vaman Potadar, Shri Sadashiva Khando Atlekar, Shri P. V. Kane and Prof. Vaman Malhar Joshi and others. These literary ginats have too opined that they had never held any objection and have no objection that Belgaum District is the part of Karnatak Province."

ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ ಬೆಳಗಾಮಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮರಾಠಿ ಭಾಷೆ ಮಾತನಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಜನರು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅದು ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಪ್ರಾಂತ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಚಳವಳಿ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥಾದ್ದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಘಂಟಾಘೋಷವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಇನ್ನೂ ಒಂದು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ವಿಷಯವಿದೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಹಿರಿಯರು ಯಾವುದೇ ಕಾರಣದಿಂದ ಹಿಂದೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಿ, ಒಂದು ಒಪ್ಪಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿರುವ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ, ನಾವು ಅದನ್ನು ಧಿಕ್ಕಾರ ಮಾಡಿ, ನಮ್ಮ ಹಿರಿಯರ ಹೆಸರಿಗೆ ತಕ್ಕಂತೆ ನಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳದಿರುವುದು ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಯೋಗ್ಯ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಆಗಿನ ನಾಯಕರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದ ಮಾತು ಆಗಿನ ಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಬೇರೆ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಏರ್ಪಾಡು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಗಲಭೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದರೆ, ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಎಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಕೊನೆ ಮೊದಲು ಎಂದು ನಾವು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ನಾನಾಗಲೇ ಹೇಳಿದಹಾಗೆ, ಯಾವುದೇ ಆದರೂ ಒಂದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ತೀರ್ಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಎಲ್ಲಿಯಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ನಿಲುಗಡೆ ಇರಬೇಕು. ಈ ಗಡಿಯನ್ನು ಇತ್ಯರ್ಥ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಏನೂ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದು ಹಳೆಯ ಕತೆ, ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ. ಎರಡು ಸಮಿತಿಗಳು ಸೇರಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಕಡೆಯ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈಗ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ನಗರದಲ್ಲಿ ಮರಾಠಿ, ತೆಲುಗು, ತಮಿಳು ಮತ್ತು ಇತರ ಭಾಷೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾತನಾಡುವ ಜನರಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಬೆಳಗಾಮ್ ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ, ಅದು ಗಲಭೆಗೆ ಸಿಕ್ಕಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಶಾಂತಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಇಂಥ ಚಳವಳಿಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯತೆ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಲ್ಲ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಗಲಭೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು, ಗೊಂದಲವೆಬ್ಬಿಸುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಲ್ಲ. ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಸಭೆ ನಡೆಯುವಾಗ ಗೌರವ ಮರ್ಯಾದೆಯಿಂದ ನಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳದೆ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ತೋರಿದಂತೆ ಗಟ್ಟಿಯಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಸಭೆಯಿಂದ ಹೊರಗೆ ಹೋಗುವುದು, ಗೊಂದಲವೇಳುವಂತೆ ನಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಲಕ್ಷಾಂತರ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಕಣ್ಣಿನಂತಿರುವವರು ನಾವು ಅವರ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳು. ಇಂಥವರು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಪ್ರದರ್ಶನ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ, ಯಾರಿಗಾದರೂ ತಲೆತಗ್ಗಿಸಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಮುಖಂಡರಾಗಿರುವವು, ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ರಾಜ್ಯಪಾಲರು ಬಂದು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತು, ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಕಾರ್ಯ ಗೌರವ ಹೀಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವಾಗ, ಗಲಭೆ, ಧಿಕ್ಕಾರ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆಂದು

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಕೆ. ವೀರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ)

ಹೇಳುವುದು ಯಾರಿಗೂ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಲ್ಲ. ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಘನತೆ ಗೌರವಗಳಿಗೆ ಸರಿಯೆ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಾನೂ ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದು ಸಾರಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾಗಿರುವ ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತೆ ಗಲಭೆ ಗೊಂದಲ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದರೆ, ಅವರಿಗೆ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ನಡೆಸುವ ಆಶಯ ಅಥವ ಉದ್ದೇಶವಿದೆಯೆ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಹಿರಿಯರು ಅನೇಕ ವರ್ಷಕಾಲ ಕಷ್ಟಪಟ್ಟು ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯವನ್ನು ಸಂಪಾದನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರ ಉದ್ದೇಶವೇನೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಇದನ್ನು ಗಮನಿಸದೆ ಹೀಗೆಲ್ಲ ನಡೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ, ಗೂಂಡಾಗಿರಿ ನಡೆಸುವ ರಾಜ್ಯವೆಂದು ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ; ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಈ ಹೊತ್ತು ಒಂದು ರೀತಿ, ನಾಳೆ ಒಂದು ರೀತಿ ನಡೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ ಗೂಂಡಾಗಿರಿಗೆ ಪ್ರಾಶಸ್ತ್ಯ ಕೊಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ; ಕಾನೂನಿಗನುಸಾರವಾಗಿ, ನಿಯಮಗಳಿಗನುಸಾರವಾಗಿ, ನಾಗರಿಕ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ನಡೆಸಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲದಂತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಚಳವಳಿ ನಡೆಸುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಲ್ಲ. ಕಠಿಣವಾದ ಪದಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರಯೋಗ ಮಾಡಲು ನನಗೆ ಇಷ್ಟವಿಲ್ಲ. ಸ್ಥೂಲವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ, ಇದು ಬಹಳ ವ್ಯಸನಕರವಾದುದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಕನ್ನಡದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಮಾತು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಕೋತಿ ತಾನು ಮೊಸರನ್ನು ತಿಂದು ಪಕ್ಕದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದ ಮೇಕೆಯ ಮೂತಿಗೆ ಒರಸಿತಂತೆ; ಇದರಿಂದ ಮೇಕೆಯೇ ತಿಂದಿತೇನೋ ಎಂದು ಅದನ್ನು ಹೊಡೆದನಂತೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಗಲಭೆ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಜನರು ಈ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟವರಲ್ಲ; ಅವರನ್ನು ಎತ್ತಿಕಟ್ಟಿರುವವರೂ ಹೊರಗಿನವರೇ. ಸತ್ಯಾಗ್ರಹವೆಂದು ನಡೆಸುವವರೂ ಹೊರಗಿನವರು, ಕಂದಾಯ ಕೊಡಬಾರದೆಂದು ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ಜನರನ್ನು ಎತ್ತಿ ಕಟ್ಟುವವರೂ ಬಹುಭಾಗ ಹೊರಗಿನವರು. ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಜನರು ಇತರರ ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ತೂಕ ಮಾಡಿನೋಡಿ ನಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಜನರು (masses) ಅಷ್ಟು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೂ ಗಲಭೆಯನ್ನುಂಟುಮಾಡಿ, ಅಶಾಂತಿ ವಾತಾವರಣವನ್ನುಂಟುಮಾಡಿದ ಜನರ ಮಾತಿಗೆ ಆ ಪ್ರಾಂತದ ಜನರು ಅಷ್ಟು ಗಮನ ಕೊಡದೇಯಿರುವುದು ಸಮಾಧಾನಕರವಾದ ಸಂಗತಿಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ನಾನೂ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಖಂಡರೂ ಆ ಪ್ರಾಂತದ ಜನರನ್ನು ಅಭಿನಂಧಿಸುತ್ತೇವೆ ಮತ್ತು ಅವರು ಮುಂದೆಯೂ ಇದೇರೀತಿ ನಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಕಾನೂನಿಗೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿ, ಕಂದಾಯ ಕೊಡಬಾರದೆಂದು ಆ ಜನರನ್ನು ಪ್ರಚೋದನೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೂ ಇದು ಎಷ್ಟು ಟೊಳ್ಳಾಯಿತೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಾವೆಲ್ಲ ಮನಗಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳಿರುವಂತೆ ಶೇಕಡ 90 ಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಬರಬೇಕಾದ ಕಂದಾಯ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಕಂದಾಯ ಕೊಡಲು ಜನರು ಮುಂದೆ ಬರುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಆದರೆ ಅವರನ್ನು ತಡೆದು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಹೆದರಿಕೆಯನ್ನುಂಟುಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಆದರೂ ಜನರು ಅವರ ಮಾತಿಗೆ ಮರುಳಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೆಲವರು ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಮುಖ್ಯಸ್ಥರು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೆಂಬಲ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದುದು ವ್ಯಸನಕರವಾದ ವಿಷಯ.

ಇನ್ನು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಅನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ, ಭಯ ಉಂಟಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ, ಶಾಂತಿಯಿಂದ ಜೀವನ ನಡೆಸುವುದು ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗಿದೆ, ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಏನೂ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬ ಅಪಾದನೆ ಕೇಳಿಬರುತ್ತಿದೆ, ಅಲ್ಲಲ್ಲಿ. ಆದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ತಕ್ಕ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಶಾಂತಿ ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆ ಮಾಡಲು, ನೆಮ್ಮದಿಯನ್ನು ಕಾಪಾಡಲು ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮತ್ತೆ ಗಡಿಯ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರತಿಸಾರಿಯೂ ಹೀಗಾಗಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡದೆ, ಕಾನೂನು ರೀತ್ಯಾ ಏನು ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾಗಿದೆಯೋ ಅದರಂತೆ ಉಳಿಯುವುದು ಉಚಿತ. ಅಥವಾ ಎರಡು ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳೂ ಒಪ್ಪಿದರೆ, ಸಣ್ಣಪುಟ್ಟ ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳು ಆ ಕಡೆ ಅಥವಾ ಈ ಕಡೆ ಸೇರಬೇಕೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಕುರಿತು ಮಾತನಾಡೋಣ. ಇದು ವಿನಾ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಐಕ್ಯರಾಗಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾಗಿರುವುದು ನಿಲ್ಲಬೇಕು. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳ ಗಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಗಲಭೆ, ದಾಂಧಲೆ, ಅಶಾಂತಿಯುಂಟಾಗಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಆಡಳಿತವನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಲು ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA (Nanjangud).—If the Hon'ble Member were to yield kindly, I have one clarification to ask. Where is it said in the States Reorganisation Act that minor adjustment is possible and where are minor adjustments defined? Is there any provision in the S.R. Act providing for minor adjustment?

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—I quite agree with the Hon'ble Member Sri Mallaradhya.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—The only provision that I see in the Act is under section 21 of the S.R. Act of 1956 which provides for the details of the functions of the Zonal Councils. It says:

> "......may discuss any recommendations made with regard to any matter concerning border disputes, linguistic minorities, inter-State transport."

So far, I do not see anywhere, where the Zonal Council has made any such recommendation. Other than that, you find no other provision.

Sri B. D. JATTI (Chief Minister).—As the Hon'ble Member Sri Mallaradhya puts it, it is correct that nowhere it has been mentioned in the S.R. Act. But I may say for the information of the House that, while this Bill was piloted by the Hon'ble Home Minister, Sri Govind Vallabh Pant, he made a reference regarding it and said a recommendation in the Zonal Council

would also have to be taken into consideration if both States agreed. With that in mind, the Hon'ble Member Sri Veeranna Gowdh is making a reference.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಕೆ. ವೀರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ.—ನಾನು ಅರಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಿಷ್ಟೆ. ಎರಡೂ ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಕೆಲವು ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗೆ, ನದಿಯ ನೀರಿನ ಉಪಯೋಗ, ಗಡಿಯ ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳ ವಿಚಾರ, ಹೇಗೆ ಎರಡು ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳಿಗೂ ಉಪಯೋಗವಾಗುವ ಯೋಜನೆಗಳಿದ್ದರೆ, ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಸ್ಪರ ಒಪ್ಪಂದದಿಂದ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇಂಥ ವ್ಯವಹಾರಗಳು ಬಂದಾಗ ಅವನ್ನು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಎರಡು ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳನ್ನುಳ್ಳ ಒಂದು ಜೋನಲ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ ಎಂದಿದೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ನಾನು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಕಾನೂನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇಂಥ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಚಾರಗಳಿಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೂ ಜೋನಲ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್‌ಗಳ ಸಂಬಂಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿವೆ. ಆಗ ಕಾರಣ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗಿದೆ. ಇಷ್ಟೇವಿನಾ, ಶ್ರೀ ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ, ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಮತ್ತೆ ಎತ್ತುವುದಕ್ಕವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೆಲವು ವರ್ಷಗಳು ನೋಡಿ, ಅನುಭವದಿಂದ ಅಮೇಲೆ ಸಣ್ಣಪುಟ್ಟ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಉದ್ವಕ್ಕೂ ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಶಾಂತಿಯಿಂದ ಬಾಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆಡಳಿತ ನಡೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಜನರ ಸೇವೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕವಕಾಶವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಬರಿಯ ಮದ್ದುಗುಂಡು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಜನರ ಸುರಕ್ಷಿತತೆಯನ್ನು ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇಷ್ಟಾಗಿ, ನಮ್ಮ ಮರಾಠಿಮಾತನಾಡುವ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ತಮಗೆ ಅನಾನುಕೂಲವಾಗಿದೆ, ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲ ಬೇರೆ ಭಾಷೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವವರೂ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗೆ ಷೋಲಾಪುರ ಟೌನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹುಮಂದಿ ಕನ್ನಡ ಮಾತನಾಡುವವರಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಲೆಕ್ಕಾಚಾರದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅದು ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಬೇಕು.

ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಸ್ಟೇಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕನ್ನಡ ಮಾತನಾಡುವವರು ಎರಡು ಲಕ್ಷ ಜನ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ; ಉಡುಪಿ ಕಡೆಯಿಂದ ಹೋದವರು ಸೇರಿ 3 ಲಕ್ಷ ಜನ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಡಿಲ್ಲಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕನ್ನಡ ಮಾತನಾಡುನವರು ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಎಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲೋ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಒಂದು ಭಾಷೆ ಮಾತನಾಡತಕ್ಕವರೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಒಂದೇ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಕೈ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಇರಬೇಕು ಎಂದರೆ ಅದು ಅಸಾಧ್ಯವಾದ ಮಾತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಗುಜರಾತಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವ ಜನ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಇಂಥ ದೊಡ್ಡ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಪಟ್ಟಣಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಭಾಷೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾತನಾಡುವ ಜನರಿಲ್ಲ! ಗುಜರಾತಿ ಜನರು ಇದ್ದಾರೆ, ಮಾರ್ವಾಡಿ ಜನಗಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಸಿಂಧಿ ಭಾಷೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾತನಾಡುವವರಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಭಾಷಾವಾರು ಪ್ರಾಂತ ಆದರೆ, ಕೋರ್ಟ್ ವ್ಯವಹಾರ ನಡೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ, ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಅರ್ಜಿ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮತ್ತು ಸ್ಕೂಲು ನಡೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇತ್ಯಾದಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ಭಾಷೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗಬಹುದು, ಕೆಲವು ಸೌಕರ್ಯಗಳಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಒಂದೇ ಭಾಷೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾತನಾಡುವವರು ಶೇಕಡ 60-70 ಜನಗಳಿದ್ದರೆ ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕವಾಗಿ ಸೇರಿಕೊಂಡು ಆಡಳಿತವನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು, ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಭಾಷೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವವರು ಇರಲೇಕೂಡದು ಬೇರೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಅಸಾಧ್ಯವಾದದ್ದು. ನಾನು ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸತಕ್ಕ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಇಷ್ಟೆ. ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆ ಆದರೂ ಇಂಥ ಹಟವಾದಿ ಮಾತಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶಕೊಡಬೇಡಿ. ನಾವೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ದೇಶದ ಪ್ರಜೆಗಳು, ಮೈಸೂರು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದರೆ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸವಾಗಲಾರದು. ತಾವು ಸಹೋದರರಾಗಿ ನಮ್ಮೊಡನೆ ಸಹಕಾರಮಾಡಿ. ಸಣ್ಣದು ಆಗಿದ್ದ ದೇಶವನ್ನು ದೊಡ್ಡದು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ವೈಯಕ್ತಿಕವಾಗಿ, ಅದು ಬೇಕಾಗಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ವಾದ ಮಾಡಿದ ಮನುಷ್ಯ ನಾನು ; ಆದರೆ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಆದ ಮೇಲೆ, ಹಿರಿಯರ ನಿರ್ಣಯಕ್ಕೆ ತಲೆಬಾಗಿದೆ. ನಾನು ಕೇಳಿರುವ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಇಡೀ ಹಿಂದೂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲೇ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ನೈಸರ್ಗಿಕ ಸಂಪತ್ತು ಬೇರೆ ಯಾವ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಕೆಲವು ಕಡೆ ಖನಿಜಸಂಪತ್ತು ನದಿಗಳ ಸಂಪತ್ತು ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಅರಣ್ಯ ಸಂಪತ್ತು, ನದಿಗಳ ಸೌಕರ್ಯ, ಖನಿಜ ಸಂಪತ್ತು ಬಂದರು ಸೌಕರ್ಯ, ಇವೆಲ್ಲ ಇವೆ. ಯಾವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ನೋಡಿದರೂ ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಉನ್ನತಮಟ್ಟದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ದೇಶವಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಜನಗಳ ಜೀವನ ಮಟ್ಟವನ್ನು ಉನ್ನತವಾದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ. ಆ ಊರಿನನಲ್ಲಿರುತ್ತೇವೆ, ಈ ಊರಿನಲ್ಲಿರುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ವಾದಿಸಿ ಜಗಳವಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ ದೇಶದ ಸಂಪತ್ತನ್ನು ವೃದ್ಧಿಪಡಿಸಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಸಂಪತ್ತಿನಿಂದ ಜನಗಳ ಜೀವನ ಮಟ್ಟವನ್ನು ಏರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಏನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಮಾಡೋಣ. ನಮ್ಮ ಜನಗಳೇ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಭಾರತೀಯರು ಎನ್ನುವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಉದಾರ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಿಂದ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ಮತ್ತು ಆರೀತಿ ನಡೆಸಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಂಡು ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಇಂಥ ಚಳವಳಿಗೆ ಬೆಂಬಲ ಕೊಡದೆ ಈಗ ಏನು ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾಗಿದೆ ಅದು ಅಖೈರು ತೀರ್ಮಾನವೆಂದು ಭಾವಿಸಬೇಕು. ಎರಡು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಗಳು ಒಪ್ಪಿದರೆ ಸಣ್ಣಪುಟ್ಟ ವಿಚಾರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಬದಲಾಯಿಸಬಹುದು. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದದರು ಒಂದು ಗಡಿ ನಿಲುವನ್ನು ತಾಳಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು, ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಯಾವ ನೀತಿಯನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಮೆಚ್ಚಿ ಮುಂದೆಯೂ ಕೂಡ ಅದೇರೀತಿ ನಡೆಸಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಸೂಚಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಇರುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅನುಮೋದಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಂಡು ನನ್ನ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The House will now rise for lunch and meet again after half an hour.

The House adjourned for recess at Ten of the Clock and re-assembled at Thirty Minutes past Ten of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair.]

†Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA (Molakalmuru).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the resolution moved by my Hon'ble friend Sri Veeranna Gowdh. The resolution, Sir, coming as it does now, is very necessary and topical. We find that there is a lot of agitation carried on by a few interested parties in Belgaum and certain parts of Karwar District and even Bidar, for some portions to be transferredto Maharashtra or Bombay State as it stands now. I fail to understand the agitation. As one who has been in this field of activity and who has taken some interest in the formation of linguistic States, not only my own State of Karnataka but also of other States, and as one who in co-operation with others in India who wanted to have their own linguistic States urged for that, I feel, I should express myself in regard to certain details and clear up certain misunderstandings and misconceptions which are entertained by large sections of people. An allegation is made and some people believe that we Kannadigas have won all along the line, that areas which did not belong to us have been added on to us and that we have much more than we deserve. It is a travesty of truth to say so, because, if I may be allowed to take the House a little backward into history, I must say that after the dissolution of the Vijayanagar and the Bahmani kingdoms, Kannada speaking areas, *viz.*, Kannada States were torn and disrupted into various States and they came under various influences. After the fall of Tippu and the disruption of the Mysore State, the whole of this area was divided. Certain parts were given to Hyderabad. Certain other parts were taken over by the British. Then again, it was divided into Madras and Mysore, and certain areas went to Bombay. For hundreds of years we have been speaking the Kannada language; not only linguistically, but also culturally, economically and politically we are one people. By our influence we have built up large empires, which dwindled in course of time and we have come under subjugation politically and culturally under various other States. That being so, we have dwindled into possibly one half of what we were before. I think, it was Sir Taylor who went into this question in some detail about 120 years ago. He said that the outpost of the Kannadigas is somewhere in Vijayadurg north of Karwar. It may interest some people to know that the first address given to the first Governor of Bombay State was in Kannada and Konkani. But we are not going to claim those areas. We are not going to claim Bombay on that account. We are not going to claim parts of other States. But the fact is that all along the line, even today, large chunks of territory in Madras like Talavadi firka, Hosur and Nilgiris, large sections, have gone over to Madras. Madakasira, Alur, Royadurga, Adoni and some other portions have gone to Madras. Equally, fairly large territories with a population of over three lakhs have gone over to Maharashtra, to Bombay State. Although we feel keenly that they are not with us, we are not going to create trouble; because it is unreasonable. We have a way of doing things. We want to approach these things with understanding, with friendship and with amity. That is the way we have to approach. Sri Veeranna Gowdh correctly put it that for the purposes of better administration, these linguistic States have come into being. I am one of those who say that if these divisions lead to disunity, we cannot have States at all. We can have a single one for the country. But because it is so large, consisting of so many languages, just with a view to enable us to rule ourselves better and to have better administration, convenient units have been formed. But to create a sort of political propaganda, to displace one part from the other and to make Belgaum City as the bone of contention between political parties is something which I cannot tolerate. Whoever is responsible for the governance of this country, either at the Centre or at the States, I want to state emphatically to them that this sort of agitation should not be allowed. Belgaum or Mysore cannot be the bone

of contention between political parties for their own ends. This is exactly what is happening in Belgaum City. This question is not new.

Look at the town of Belgaum. The names of the streets are not in Marathi. They are Kannada names, which shows that they are Kannada speaking people. Of course some people are Maharashtrians. In commercial towns, where there are centres of administration, we cannot claim on linguistic basis. Even there they are not in a clear majority. Even in the census of 1951—I am sure the figures are not correct. I as the President of the Karnatak P.C.C. protested against that. Still the census was carried on.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—In the census of 1951, Mr. Boemen was the Census Commissioner of Bombay. If I remember correctly, in his report, he said that no census was taken on the basis of the mother-tongue. That is a report which can be verified. They have been taken only on the census tracts and not by villages and towns.

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.—That is the report. Whatever it is, big cities, either commercial or industrial or centres of administration, they cannot be added on to some party merely on the question of language. In our own Centre of Administration, the Capital, Bangalore—what is the percentage of Kannadigas ? What is the percentage of Tamilians and Telugus ? We are in a minority. But can it lay in the mouth of anybody to say that this city belongs to them because they are a big linguistic group, either Tamilians or Telugu people ? Therefore merely on the basis of language, big centres of administration and industrial cities cannot be divided. Belgaum has been the administrative headquarters of the Southern Division of Bombay consisting of the four districts of Belgaum, Dharwar, Bijapur and Karwar for nearly one hundred years or a little over. Kannada people have built up educational institutions all over. There are more than half a dozen colleges there. There is of course only one College—Rani Parvathi Devi College...

Sri B. D. JATTI (Chief Minister).—Rani Parvathi Devi College came into Mysore after the merger of Jamkhandi and not before.

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.—Therefore, we have built up Belgaum City. If you divide this headquarter, what amount of disruption there will be ! How can you carry on administration ? You cannot put a divisional headquarter in a day. Historically and culturally—if you go back into history—you will see that it belongs to us. It has been decided not by us. I am glad to say that Sri N. G. Kelkar, the undoubted leader of Maharastrians, as long ago as 1920-21, when Congress decided to fight on linguistic principles, gave Bellary district, which was another bone of contention, and also Belgaum district to us. Then again, as Sri Veeranna Gowdh pointed out, when they wanted to hold a conference of the literary giants, all the leaders of literature of Maharashtra admitted that Belgaum belonged to Karnataka. When the Congress session was held in 1924, the only session wherein Mahatma Gandhi presided, it was in Belgaum that was in Karnataka. I cannot understand why there is so much confusion over it.

I do not want to dwell much more on this question. Belgaum City cannot go to Maharashtra by any reason. It is not a secret of mine, and I think the Chief Minister will not take objection if I say that when I was the Chief Minister, I had correspondence with Mr. Chavan, the Chief Minister of Bombay, and therein I had made things specifically clear that claims for parts of Karwar district should not be made, and that no part belonged to them, that they had no claim over Belgaum City because it could not belong to them. On account of that I had already urged and I requested him not to claim Nippani, because this is a commercial town and there is no use in claiming it.

Apart from this, I am willing to sit across the table and discuss these matters with them. My Maharashtrian friends have prepared a very interesting map. They go far into our territory.

(SRI S. NIJALINGAPPA)

It does not matter. If we prepare a map, possibly we may do likewise. I have asked both the parties to prepare maps. They have prepared one which you may consider unreasonable. But now you prepare one but do not be too ambitious in doing so. That has been our tradition. Let both the parties sit together and then it will be easier to draw the line. That will leave very small disputed areas. That is why the words 'minor adjustment' are mentioned there. There can be minor adjustments but there can be no scope whatever for major changes. With friendship and mutual understanding it is still possible to exchange a few villages.

Now, I come to Karwar. Their claim to parts of Karwar District, especially to Karwar Taluk and Supa Taluk is really funny. I have looked into the maps prepared by the Bombay Government and from the tables given in it I find that in Karwar Taluk, except in one village, one island known as Devgad where out of a population of 1100 only seven are Maharashtrians, in the other villages they are all Kannadigas. They want it because it has a light house. Possibly one family or two are taking care of it. In Supa Taluk also there are not many Marathi-speaking people. In those two taluks and also in some adjacent taluks a large section of the population are Konkanis. So, these two taluks will go to whichever area the Konkanis will go. To claim them, a very funny argument is made, namely, that the Konkani language is akin to Marathi. I have looked into the matter and consulted some scholars also. Kaka Kalelkar speaks Konkani and we once asked him in a Select Committee, "Well, Kaka Saheb, what about this Konkani language? Does it belong to Karnatak or Maharashtra?" He said that it did not belong to either Karnatak or Maharashtra. He said, "Ours is an independent language and we do not owe allegiance to anybody nor are we influenced by anybody." They have no script and it is only a spoken language, though it is fairly well developed. Possibly, they are having this language for the last thousand years or so. They speak Konkani and write in Kannada. These Konkanasthas came from Goa originally. Mr. S. G. Silva, a very keen student of languages and himself a Konkanastha, has delved deep into the history of his language and given us very important and useful information. He says that it was only a spoken language without any script and that they were writing in Kannada This is what he says in his book:

"These are some of the signatures of the Shenvis on the documents of the title deeds of the early 16th century found in the collection of documents known as Floral de salcette in the Panjim Archives. These writings show that the script followed by the Shenvis in Goa was Kannada and the language was Konkani. When the Shenvis first came to Goa in the 10th century (?), the kingdom was ruled by the Kadamba family (900 to 1200 A.D.) and the official language of the State was Kannada. From the time of their earliest occupation of Goa these Shenvis were mainly traders and as such they were called Smarths. (Even today in Goa the word Smarth means a trader.) As traders they had vast dealings with all the west coast of India and in these dealings they used Konkani language with the Kannada script and this language was known as Kansvi language. After the introduction of Portuguese as the official language and the suppression of the Konkani language in 1684, teachers were employed to teach this language to boys and to shop assistants. This continued till the advent of the Europeans in the 16th century and even later. The newly come Europeans of the 16th century had to come across these writings in their trade dealings. They could not understand what language it was. It was not Kannada, though the script was Kannada. So they

gave it a new name and called it Canarin language and the people who spoke and wrote it Canarins as opposed to Canarese. The Dutch of the times have made special reference to this language and the people. Thus all shop accounts, shop letters, etc., were written in Kannada script and Konkani language. When the Shenvis came to the Sonda and Bednore Empire in the 16th century after the destruction of their temples in Goa, wherever they settled they used the same script and language. Thus such account books were found in Ankola also. I have seen such letters and shop accounts in the old files of Laxman Baban Pai of Ankola and in the old papers of the Kadwad Vaishnava Math. Some of these papers of the shop accounts written in Kanzvi language I had brought from Goa. A similar feature may be marked of another community".

This is significant. Then, he proceeds :

"The Joshis (astrologers) of Karwar Taluka write the Kannada language in Nagari characters. This shows that they are typically people from Maharashtra and became Kannadised, after coming to Karwar."

This clearly shows that the Konkanasthas had no script of their own except Kannada from the tenth century onwards. I do not know what was their script before. This being the case, how can it lie in the mouth of anyone to say that the Konkanasthas are related to Maharashtrians ? They are spread over mainly in Goa and in South Kanara and North Kanara in Mysore and in Malabar and it is curious that they write the Konkani language in the respective script of the area in which they live. In Marathi area they write Marathi language and in Kannada area they write in Kannada and in Malabar they write in Malayalam. There are three to four lakhs of them in the present Mysore State and about a lakh in Malabar. Their concentration is the biggest in our State. Therefore, I do not think it is reasonable for anybody to claim them as theirs. Another thing is that the Indian Census of 1951 collected statistics regarding the mother tongue and the second language in South Kanara and North Kanara and particularly in North Kanara ; when they were asked as to what their second language was, 90 per cent of the Konkanasthas gave Kannada as their second language and not Marathi. Seven to eight per cent speak Marathi. Similar statistics have been prepared in respect of Malabar District also. There the second language is Malayalam and 95 per cent speak Malayalam and 5 per cent speak Kannada. This clearly shows that they adopt the language of the area in which they live. It is a clear proof that those people have to remain in Mysore only. I cannot understand claiming them either as Maharashtrians or as anything else. If this is accepted, and it must be accepted, I cannot understand how anybody can lay claim for either Karwar or Supa as belonging to them. Therefore these two taluks cannot go either to Bombay or future Maharashtra. I am putting this very emphatically because linguistically and culturally those people belonged to Goa and before they migrated to Mysore they were writing their language in Kannada.

11-00 A.M.

Regarding Belgaum City, I have said what I have got to say. Regarding Bidar, they are making some claim. It is very light and not loud. I think the members coming from Hyderabad area will bear me out that before the States Reorganisation Act came into existence, the three linguistic groups—the members of the Assembly coming from the areas of Kannada, Telugu and Marathi—sat together and discussed the matter threadbare and came to the conclusion that certain areas belonged to Kannada speaking people, certain areas to Telugu speaking people and certain other areas to Marathi speaking people. As a result of the agreement amongst the representatives, there have been divisions. I cannot understand the

(SRI S. NIJALINGAPPA)

people taking up the question again. It is unreasonable and objectionable. I would not have dealt with this at great length but for the remark that we have been given more areas. It is to a large extent not correct. No doubt we have got areas from Telugu but there is another question, as Shri H. K. Veeranna Gowdh rightly pointed out, that there is no State in India which has got only one language except possibly Uttar Pradesh. That being the case I cannot understand people making a fetish about it. The most important thing to be considered is: have the minority suffered or are they having a fair deal at the hands of the State or not? I challenge if any Maharashtrians in Mysore have suffered in any way. Everything possible has been done to them. Several schools have been newly started wherever they asked for. The records have been printed in both the languages. Everything that is possible has been and is being done according to the directions given by the Home Ministry. All the directions given by the Home Ministry are being strictly adhered to. They have no case for complaint and I do not know what has happened for this cry to be raised. As I have said it already and I again repeat that we shall not allow our area to be the bone of contention of any party. They want to become heroes. They say, "In Belgaum we have used violence and so in the next election vote for us" People who are afraid of losing it also say, "We fought and we will fight and so vote for us." This attitude, I for one cannot tolerate and this House will certainly not tolerate. I am very emphatic about this because I feel strongly about the way in which the entire issue is approached. I have got very good friends on both the sides. I have valued friends; they do not do this. It is only a few elements—I do not want to use a strong word such as anti-social—that are creating trouble. I myself was a witness of a most unseemly thing when I was in Belgaum last. When we were holding a conference, our people were stoned and one man was mdae naked in the street and abused. I must say that such anti-social acts of violence and objectionable attitude cannot be given a premium. It looks as though our respectable approach and restraint over these things are at a discount or people think that we have no case. On the other hand we have a very good case for several years.

Though it is not relevant to the present resolution, because this mostly refers to the dispute between us and Bombay, I cannot but mention that several areas which really should belong to us are in certain other States. Regarding Kasargod, the correspondence I had when I was the Chief Minister with the ex-Chief Minister of Kerala would show that even though the reasonableness of our claim is admitted, it is being unnecessarily put off. Similarly we have certain areas like Akkalkot where 90 per cent of the people speak Kannada. Similarly in Hosur large portion of areas belong to us. We are not creating trouble; we have been corresponding and if necessary we will sit across the table and decide. After all we belong to the same nation but our problems are different. There are various other problems. Economic problems stare at us. At a time like this we do not wish to create trouble, and incite people to acts of violence; we are restrained and in fact many people find fault with us for being so. I am one of those against whom such criticism is levelled and I am accused that I am too soft and that I do not do anything for them. I may say that we shall not do such acts. There is the Bombay Government and let us sit together and settle our problems. There are national problems facing us and most important of all is the economic problem. Our economy is so low that it has to be attended to first. Linguistic minority in no way can suffer if the respective Governments are honest. We have been very fair and very honest. That being the case I am sorry that this agitation should be kept up not by the local people but by others. They try to create trouble in the collection of land revenue. Long before, when we were fighting for

freedom with a foreign Government, we were doing it. But while we are free and when we have our own Government, this campaign of not paying land revenue is unthinkable. Responsible people go and tell people not to pay up the land revenue. Let us be reasonable. I am not at all narrow-minded nor anybody in this House is narrow-minded. We shall sit across the table and settle this issue. It is true that though the State Reorganisation Act did not give any direction, we have constituted the Zonal Councils.

Of course, they are in the nature of advisory bodies. We discussed these problems sometimes. Nobody can force these things on us. But we can do much more than the Act contemplates. It all depends upon our approach to these problems Therefore I tell my friends—Maharashtrian friends who are creating this trouble and disaffection in that area: "Please do not accept this attitude and if you accept this unreasonable and objectionable attitude, we are not going to yield. Let this excitement settle down. We are here to sit and talk it out. If there is real trouble, we will not attend to this. Let things settle down; there are points we can talk over. But it cannot be done by a display of threats. We are not going to yield to these things." I am sure, I am voicing-except perhaps about half a-dozen friends—I am voicing the sentiments of this House, when I say WE WILL NOT YIELD TO PRESSURE. (*Applause*). Therefore, Sir, this Resolution has been brought at the proper time. As I said, we belong to the same country and we will decide these things by a warmer approach, not by a violent approach.

Therefore, Sir, I wholeheartedly support this resolution which has been so ably moved by my Hon'ble friend Sri Veeranna Gowdh and in doing so, let me also make it clear that this resolution has reference mostly to our dispute between Bombay and Mysore Borders. Let not the Kasargod and Akkalkot people think that we have let them down. Let me take this opportunity to tell them and to assure hem that we will approach this problem in a better way, in a more dignified way, the way of friendship and reason, with Bombay.

Therefore, Sir, I once again add my own appeal to these few Maharashtrian friends not to carry on this agitation. You cannot solve this by this sort of an objectionable approach. Sit with us and solve these problems.

I therefore feel, Sir, that this resolution is in good time and this Hon'ble House will kindly support it. Thank you.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Sir, I have heard patiently the arguments advanced by the Proposer of this Resolution as well as our ex-Chief Minister Sri S. Nijalingappa. I requested the Proposer to speak in English so that I can follow every word of the trend of his argument. But he spoke in Kannada, which language is very difficult for me to follow—especially the Kannada of this part of the country. I can follow the language spoken in the Northern Karnatak, but it is rather difficult for me to follow the Kannada of this place. Still, I could get some impression from his speech.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Ours is pure Kannada.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—It may be. The Northern Karnatak people say their Kannada is pure. But we are not entering into any controversy over it just now.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Please do not create controversy where none exists.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—The arguments advanced by both the Hon'ble Members practically centre round the town of Belgaum; and Mr. Nijalingappa has centred his attention, besides Belgaum also on the Kenkan parts of the Karwar District. These are the bones of contention according to them. Before I deal with our case, Sir, I should like to point out, that both of them have referred to certain decisions, certain opinions expressed somewhere in 1921 or in 1922 or even earlier, by the giant Marathi Literary Conference. May I point out to them in the most humble manner that in 1921, or 1924 or 1925, we were all subject to the Imperial Rule and that we were all

(SRI V. S. PATIL)

trying or struggling to get ourselves out of that Imperial Rule? There was therefore no question of any linguistic State or even Independence that was pending before this Literary Conference. They were merely holding some conference and it was very difficult to have even an idea as to whether there would be a linguistic State or whether India would be divided into linguistic provinces. There was absolutely no idea at that time at all. There were more than 500 States......

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—What about the Simon Commission of 1928?

Sri V. S. PATIL.—The Simon Commission came subsequently. So, I submit, Sir, there was no question of India being divided into linguistic States when these assurances were given.

There is another aspect. The national movement was started mainly by Lokamanya TILAK and the question of Independence was mooted by that great patriot. He being a man of Poona, he had some disciples at Belgaum and for that reason, in order to have a hold on Karnatak for this national movement, an office was established there only for that purpose. That was the reason, one of the political reasons why Belgaum was treated at that time when we were subjected to foreign rule, as headquarters of the Karnatak Province, because Mysore was out of question at that time,being a separate State. It was only the Kannada tracts of the districts of Dharwar, Karwar, Bijapur and Belgaum—these were the only tracts under the British Rule directly. Even the Hyderabad area that is integrated also belonged to a separate State and it was not within the purview of those leaders at that time.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—What about South Kanara and Bellary?

Sri V. S. PATIL.—I do not know about Bellary. But regarding other areas, as I just mentioned, they were completely separate and they could not have any uniform body, so far as that area was concerned. So, I submit that whatever might have been done at that time, it has absolutely no reference in the present context.

Sri Nijalingappa was pleased to say that one Mr. TAYLOR has extended the boundary of Karnataka 128 miles from Karwar to Vijayadurg. May I point out, Sir, that so far as history is concerned, the Resident of this place Lt. Col. Marquis wrote in 1810 the History of Mysore whith the help of documents that were available in Mysore Durbar and the adjoining territories. There he has mentioned the territories and boundaries of Maharashtra and Karnataka, on page 7. He has said:

> "That from Bidar Marathi language is spread over the whole country to the north-westward of the Kanara and of a line which passing considerably to the eastward of Doulatabad forms an irregular sweep until it touches Tapti river and follows the course of that river to the Western Sea on which the District of Sadasivagadh in the North Kanara forms its southern limit."

This is what they have said. If we go by history, then the Lt. Colonel, the Resident of this place, has written in 1810 that the Marathi country, so far as western coast is concerned, goes up to Sadasivgad. Sadasivgad is just adjoining Karwar. It is divided by the river Kalinadi.

AN HON'BLE MEMBER.—What about the official language of the Maharastrians?

Sri V. S. PATIL.—He has stated people's language. It has nothing to do with the official language either of the Marathi people or that of the Kannada people. I submit that instead of going into the past history and whatever happened then, we have to look to what is happening today, and what the people desire to have. We are to govern this country. For that purpose our leaders have decided to divide this country on the basis of language. Being a democracy, it is the desire of everyone to know the acts of the Government or the State. That is

the main reason. That is why our country has been divided mainly on the basis of languages. That being the case, we have to see what particular parts are to be adjusted. My friend has referred, and our Chief Minister has several times referred to adjustments of minor issues. Certainly when the whole country was divided into 13 or 14 provinces, it was natural that some pockets here and there remained in one area, which belonged to other States. That was why the Zonal Council was appointed, and they were given the power to reconcile these matters, and for that purpose, these major and minor issues must have been included in the speech delivered by His Excellency the Governor after the re-organisation. He had also referred in his speech about minor adjustments. So that thing has been carried over up till now by the Government. I understand that at present the attitude of the whole of North Karnataka is that they wish to join Bombay. That is a major adjustment. But our Chief Minister and all other Government officers are bent upon saying that that will be a minor issue. It is a very novel thing to say that this may be considered as a minor issue. That appears to be their attitube. Belgaum, Sir, is only a few miles-eight or ten miles away from the Bombay border. Even in respect to Belgaum City, it is said that this is only a minor issue. Sri Nijalingappa has stated that Belgaum being the headquarters of a division, some other people might have come there. When he was the Chief Minister of Mysore, he has accepted what was the percentage of the Marathi people and the Kannada people that have migrated to Belgaum. He had tried to find out whether Marathi people had migrated to Belgaum in greater number or Kannada people had migrated to Belgaum, and he has received an official report. It is that the greater number of population that has migrated recently was of Kannada people.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—May I take it that migration is a cause for asking for that area ? Can this be the ground that people coming from outside who are in large numbers are asking the others to clear out ?

Sri V. S. PATIL.—I have been saying that the Government tried to find out who are the people whether Marathis or Kannada people—who migrated. Government have found that Kannada people have migrated and not the Marathi people. Marathi people were originally there. The percentage clearly shows that Kannada people during the last 30 to 35 years have come in large numbers. That was why it was suppressed. It was not brought before this House.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, there seems to be an allegation against the Government which should be noted that a report made on the floor of the House has been suppressed. I want the Hon'ble Minister to take note of it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Who is the Minister in charge ? Sri Basavalingappa is here, he may take note of it.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Lastly, I have to point out that we have to go by democracy. In the last general elections, we have fought on this very basis of linguistic provinces. May I bring to the notice of this Hon'ble House the number of votes which we took as against the Kannada candidates so far as these five constituencies are concerned ? I am giving the number.

Belgaum City :

The population is :		1,11,000
Number of voters	...	53,520
Votes we got	...	22,179
Votes Congress got	...	15,915
That means we got	...	58·2%
And Congress got	...	41·8%

Here I have to mention one more thing. The Congress candidate was not a Kannada man. He was specially selected from the Muslim community and he was given a ticket of Congress just before the elections.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—You are giving the reason for his not being elected.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—The bulk of votes given to him was Muslim votes—on communal lines.

Belgaum I:

The population is	...	90,000
Total number of voters	..	42,973
I got ...	...	18,016
Congress got	...	12,063
That means I got	...	59.96%
And Congress got	...	40.4%

Mr. SPEAKER.—Was he also a Muslim candidate who contested against you?

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Here my own assistant was taken away or bought over by the Congress and set up against me. He is a Maratha by caste. He does not know a single letter of Kannada. That man was taken up by the Congress at the nick of time, because he was demanding a ticket from me and I had told him that it was not his business to be in this Assembly—as a man who was not knowing English or Kannada was of no use in this House. That was why he was taken over by the Congress and set up against me. Even then he got 40 per cent with the help of Kannada people.

Then Belgaum II, *i.e.*, North.

Here also the total population is:		90,000
The total number of voters		42,214
Sri Samaji got	...	17,446
The Congress got	...	15,549
that is 52.8 was ours and	...	
Congress got	...	47.2%

Here the Congress President stood for election and the constituency was changed ten days before the election to include some more Kannada villages in that constituency. In spite of that the Marathi candidate won.

Then Khanapur where Sri Birje was elected.

The population is	...	1,19,000
Total number of voters		54,853
Sri Birje got	...	26,461
Congress got	...	12,822

That means, we got 67.3 per cent of votes and Congress obtained 32·7 per cent. Then Nipani. It is also the bone of contention according to them. The total population of Nipani Constituency is 88,316. We fought the election on the question whether we should remain in this State or go to Bombay.

11-30 A.M.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—They stood on Congress ticket and they have lost.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—We do not want Sri Narasimhan as our friend. Save us from our friends.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—The number of voters in Nipani constituency is 46,928. Our friend Mr. Naik got 26,069 votes wheras the Congress got only 7,737. The percentage of votes obtained by us is 76.2 and they got 23.8. This shows that in the constituency in which we fought elections on this issue, the electorate has given a clear verdict and if you are going to honour the wishes of the people, I submit that all these areas would have to be included in Maharashtra and cannot be kept in Mysore. Sri Nijalingappa has very vehemently said that by no stretch of imagination Belgaum can belong to Maharashtra. If he is going to rely upon facts that by accident this area has been included in the Mysore State......

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—By design.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—I will tell you why it was included. It was because Gujarathi people wanted Bombay. They wanted to see that Bombay should not go to Maharashtra. That is why they have made a common cause with our friends here and practically Belgaum was given as a prize. This is an allegation I am making on the floor of this House knowing the full consequences.

Sri M. MALLIKARJUNASWAMY.—(Malavalli).—If the Hon'ble Member were to yield for a minute or two, I would like to convince him.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—No. Then Nijalingappa dealt very ably with the question of Konkani. Konkani that is spoken north of Karwar is quite different from the Konkani that is spoken south of Karwar. There is a distinction between the two. Konkani language that is spoken north of Karwar is akin to the language spoken not only in Goa but also in Rathnagiri District. Those two languages are similar and that is why in 1951, the Government of Bombay have passed a resolution stating that Konkani of this part is a dialect of Marathi.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE (Chikodi). — What about Konkani language of Karwar ?

Sri V. S. PATIL.—I am referring to north of Karwar. I am not speaking about Karwar proper.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—Whether it is north of Karwar or south of Karwar, it is the same language.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU (Cubbonpet).—Can a decision like that by way of a resolution give it an authenticity ? Is it by resolution that we can solve such questions ?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—And that too, by a third party.

Sri C. K. RAJAIAH SETTY (Chiknaikanhally).—Can the Government decide the category of a particular language ?

Mr. SPEAKER.–The Hon'ble Member need not quote the Bombay Government.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—It has been circulated. I want to bring it to the notice of the House.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—What is the number of the Resolution?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member may give his opinion. He should not drag the Bombay Government into the discussion.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—If that is a challenge, as some of the Hon'ble Members have stated here, I submit, they may take a plebiscite in Supa and Karwar Taluks about the desire of the people to remain here or to go to Maharashtra. Let those Konkani people decide whether they want to remain in Mysore or in Maharashtra and if they decide in favour of Mysore, we have not got the least objection.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—Did not the election there decide the issue ? Why did not Maharashtra Ekikaran Samithi put up any candidate there ?

Sri V. S. PATIL.—In Karwar all the three candidates are Maharashtrians ; Mr. Gaonkar is a Maharashtrian ; Sri Pawar who opposed him is a Maharashtrian ; Mr. Kadam who opposed both these candidates is a Maharashtrian.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—Let not the Hon'ble Member bring in communalism into politics; they contested elections on Congress ticket.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—I have to bring in communalism because I have to follow Sri Kothavale.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—If you had followed me, you would not have degenerated into such a level.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Gaonkar's mother tongue is Marathi ; Kadam's mother tongue is Marathi ; Sri Pawar's mother tongue is Marathi. This shows that there was no question of Kannada arising at all at that time. The election was fought only on party basis. Sri Kadam belongs to P.S.P.; Sri Pawar belongs to Communist; Sri Gaonkar belongs to Congress. So, I did not refer to the decision of the poll there.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—Sri Gaonkar speaks Konkani language and not Marathi.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Let us come to this compromise. Let us appoint these three candidates to decide whether their Konkani is akin to Marathi or not.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—Did the Maharashtra Ekikaran Samithi claim that area at the time of election ? Did you put up candidates to contest ? If not, why did you not put up candidates there ?

Sri V. S. PATIL.—The thing is, there was a dispute whether ticket is to be given to P.S.P. or Communist and we tried to bring about a compromise. But both the parties did not

(SRI V. S. PATIL)

agree. Therefore we did not put up candidates. The Samithi consists of all opposition parties and even in Belgaum area, for some time, Marathi Congress people were also with us up till election.

At the time of the elections they went away. When there was no compromise, we allowed them to fight on their party tickets. That is why the Samithi could not put up their official candidate. Even now I am in favour of this proposal. Let there be a plebiscite on this issue and let those people decide.

Sri M. MALLIKARJUNASWAMY.—I respectfully submit that we need not take into consideration the result of the election because it depends upon the psychology of the voters, the affinity to the political party and the individuals who are contesting.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—I should like to submit that even though we have secured complete majority in these constituencies we are not claiming the whole constituency as b longing to Maharashtra. We are claiming only those villages where we have a clear majority and not those where there is a majority of Kannadigas. If you take only those Marathi villages which we are claiming, you will find that we have got more than 65 to 70 per cent of the votes in that area. We are not claiming a single village where there is a majority of Kannadigas. This position being clear, I submit that these adjustments ought to have been made long before instead of being allowed to hang fire for a long time. Sri Nijalingappa said, "let us sit across the table and try to solve this problem". We have been sitting across the table for the last three years and still nothing has come out of it. This Government has not even the right man to go and discuss this matter. Even the Zonal Council is a still-born body because it is going to be abolished within a few days. Things have come to such a pass. So, this will show that this talk of sitting across the table is merely saying something without any substance. Three years have elapsed and nothing has been done in this matter. So, I submit that this matter must be taken up by the Central Government.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Whose responsibility is it to bring it before the Zonal Council ? It is not the Mysore Government that is anxious to get any additional territory. Why have our Maharashtrian friends who are so very keen not raised this subject in any of the meetings of the Zonal Council and why blame this Government ?

Sri V. S. PATIL.—So far as the Zonal Council procedure is concerned, the Hon'ble the Chief Minister knows it. Unless both the Chief Ministers agree, a matter cannot be brought before the Zonal Council.

Sri M. MALLIKARJUNASWAMY.—Every time we sit across the table we sit with the right men whereas they sit with the wrong men with the imperialistic motive of divide and rule.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—So far as that point is concerned, the Bombay Government have prepared the man and it is the Mysore Government that has not prepared any man for this purpose. So, there is no question of preparing the right or wrong man. The ex-Chief Minister Sri Nijalingappa said that this issue should not be made a political issue or that advantage should not be taken by political parties. I may say that it is not the political parties that are taking advantage of this situation but the political groups within the party that are taking advantage of it. In this connection, I should like to bring to your notice the kind of speech delivered by Sri Nijalingappa today and the one made by him when he was the Chief Minister. This is what he said in 1956 on this same subject :—

> "I need not enumerate the various areas with which I am concerned just now. I must also admit at the same time that there are areas—small areas no doubt—where the majority of people speak languages different from Kannada. I for one would not hesitate to have those areas included in their respective linguistic states".

This is what he said when he was the Chief Minister and today what he says is, "We are not going to yield in any case so far as the question of Belgaum is concerned". Is this justified and proper ? This means that a group in the ruling party wants to see that certain persons are put down and certain persons are lifted up. That is not the case with us. By our peaceful movement we are placing the facts before this Government, before the Government of Bombay, before the Central Government and before the public of India at large. We have been put to a very great loss and that is why we want that we must be given a chance to join our territory. So far as ill-treatment is concerned, this is not the occasion to deal with it. Sri Nijalingappa said that Maharashtrians had not suffered. I can point out thousands of examples during the last three years where we have been ill-treated or treated like subordinate people. A ruling party has arisen here and they think that they are the rulers We cannot tolerate it or are not expected to tolerate it. That is why I submit that this Government and this Assembly should take a sympathetic and democratic attitude to relieve us so that we can join our territory.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ನಾಗೂರ್ (ಬಿಜಾಪುರ)—ನಾನೊಂದು ವಿನಂತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. 1956 ನೆಯ ಸ್ಟೇಟ್ ರೀ ಆರ್ಗನೈಸೇಷನ್ ಆಕ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಸರಗೋಡು, ಮಡಕಸಿರ, ರಾಯದುರ್ಗ, ಹೊಸೂರು, ಜತ್ ಇವು ಯಾವುದನ್ನೂ ಕೇಳುವ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯೇ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಕ್ತಾಯ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ತಾವೂ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ quote ಮಾಡಿ ಹೇಳಿ, ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—As pointed out by Sri Narasimhan, this is a subject of absorbing interest. After all, it is now one o'clock and not even one person from this side has spoken. I would therefore like this discussion to be extended to Monday with the concurrence of the Leader of the House.

I suggest to the Speaker that the discussion be extended by a day so that all sections of the House may be enabled to express their views on this important subject.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Sir, another thing is, the Bombay Legislature is also passing such a resolution. If discussion is extended upto Monday, our participation in discussion on that day would be helpful.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—I appeal to the Government to consider the point of extending the discussion for Monday also. If the Government wants to have a clear verdict, some of the members on this side also have to take part in this debate.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—We did not know that this motion would be taken up today. When we decided to have a morning session we thought that this afternoon we would be free. If you insist on closing the debate today alone, we shall have to sit in the afternoon al o. That would mean that the object of having a morning sess.on is efeated. Various sections of this House have got to express their opinion. Considering from any standpoint of view, it may not be proper to close the debate today. I suggest that the Government may accept the suggestion made by Sri J. B. Malla-radhya.

Sri B D. JATTI.—The Government is not insisting that the discussion of this resolution should be over today only If the Hon'ble Members feel that they cannot finish their speeches today, I have no objection to continuing it and if possible we can sit late today and if necessary take it up on Monday also.

Mr. SPEAKER.—We will sit late today. I want to give chances to as many members as possible to take part in the debate. Though I have prescribed a time-limit, it has not been possible for the Hon'ble Members to stick to it. So, we can sit a little late, *i.e*, upto 1-30 P.M. today and take it up on Monday also.

†Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—I wish to say a few words on this resolution in general support of it. I have not taken any active part in any linguistic controversies. This is a vital matter which has been agitating the minds of the people of not only this State but

(Sri V. Srinivasa Shetty)

many other States as well. I do not want to make it a party matter at all. When vital interests of a state or the nation are at stake, it will be anti-national or anti-social to make it a party issue. If it is in the interest of not only of this State but also of Bombay, it is the bounden duty of not only the ruling party but the opposition as well to be honest about their convictions and to state their views. I take that view and shall say a few words. I am feeling very unhappy at the trends of events that are taking place not only in this State, but in other States as well. I wish to bring to the notice of this House the very unhappy news which we came to know yesterday about the shooting incident of a very honest and upright District Superintendent of Police in Shimoga. Simultaneously we got the news of a shooting incident concerning the Deputy Commissioner and the D S.P. of Belgaum. I am not going to make allegations against anybody. I very strongly condemn the trend of events in the State. That is the tendency which we are here to condemn from whomsoever it comes.

I very emphatically condemn this mental attitude of certain sections of people, official or non-official, who want to take law into their own hands or decide a dispute by violence.

[Sri R. G. Kamath in the Chair]

That has been condemned again and again by all parties. I wish to add my humble voice and condemn the attitude. Sir, as I said, we do not mind Belgaum going to Bombay. I am going to say we do not mind that, if it is the will of the majority, the overwhelming majority of a certain area not to remain in a State. I personally or my party is not coming in the way of any area going over to any State. I am not going to say Belgaum should remain as a Kannada area. That is not my view at all. I have listened to the speeches of my Hon'ble friends on the other side, Sri Veeranna Gowdh and Sri Nijalingappa. With what little knowledge I have got, I consider that the demand made for the wholesale transfer of certain areas to another State is unjust and I oppose that. If it is a case where an overwhelming majority of the people are not in favour of remaining in one State and if certain areas should belong to a certain other State historically, then it is not a fair thing to compel them to remain in a particular State. I will give an example of Kasargod, because we cannot deal with these cases piecemeal. I am going to say that even the Central Government, or the States of Bombay and Mysore should not take these things piecemeal at all. If they are to decide the boundaries once again, let us not give occasion to Kasargod people to put in another agitation; let us not give another opportunity to a number of areas which my friend Sri Nijalingappa just now mentioned, to agitate again and again till eternity for change of boundaries. If it is the agreed view of the elders of Delhi, of the two States of Bombay and Mysore, if all the political parties desire that we have to redraw the map of India again, let us take all the cases together. We have no objection. Let us not take the case of individual areas like Belgaum, I agree, is a misconception that this area belongs to Maharashtra, and that area belongs to Kerala. I know in my own District of South Kanara, innumerable people from Kerala go there and settle down. There is an area north of Chandragiri which admittedly historically belongs to Karnatak. When the S.R. Commission came to Mangalore and took evidence, it was expressed to the Members of the Commission that there was no area in dispute north of Chandragiri. Yet we find that it was allotted to Kerala because Kerala people had come and settled down there. A number of people are there, whether majority or minority, and a dispute is going on. There is no reason why a certain area where a certain number of people speaking a certain language predominate, should go to another State. For example, take Bangalore itself. Once upon a time it was suggested that Bangalore should go to Andhra or Tamilnad because we find that Kannada speaking people are in a

minority. Is that a reason? I personally do not wish to admit that when a majority of the people speak another language, that area should go to another State. Because a certain number of people in Belgaum or Karwar Taluk speak one language, should it go to Maharashtra? It should not be the criterion at all that those areas should go to Bombay or Kerala or Andhra. Sir, as far as I know, many people, even Britishers. Anglo-Indians and outsiders come and settle in Bangalore and because of its salubrious climate and very good life that they can lead here, they come and settle down here. Who can prevent them? It is so in Belgaum and Poona. They have practically the same climatic conditions and they are very good places to reside. I know many Maharashtrians came and settled down in Belgam City for the salubrious climate it has, the educational facilities it has and many other things as well. Now, we find a good number of Maharashtrians there.

12 NOON.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA (Gubbi).—May I point out that while his friends in Parliament are agitating that they want Belgaum, you as Leader of the Opposition are saying that you do not want Belgaum? There is a conflict in statements. I want to know the clear picture.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—My Hon'ble friend has obviously mistaken my view. I have never said that this should go to that place or this place. I said that if it was the overwhelming will of the people of any area not to remain in a State, nobody can prevent them. If certain people come and settle down in a certain area, later on, an argument should not be put forth that thay are in a majority and that that area should, therefore, be transferred to another State. No State can be static. If dynamism is introduced among the people, they go and settle down in a certain area. How can they claim that area? For instance, I will give you one example. Tungabhadra area. Many of the Kannada people are unwilling to go and settle there. Andhras are coming in innumerable number and in the same manner the Telugu people can claim the Tungabhadra Canal area and say that the whole of it belongs to Andhra. Can that argument be built up as a valid argument at all? That is not a valid argument. I know the Hon'ble the Chief Minister feels a little bit unhappy and we have to pity his position. I know it is only the most vocal people that get a hearing here. My poor people from Kasargod do not get a hearing at all. I had occasion to mention during the debate on the Governor's Address that the Government had not the courtesy to mention Kasargod at all, whereas they mentioned Belgaum and they have mentioned certain areas of Mysore-Bombay border. What about other areas? That is to say, any persons who create noise,—I do not say mischief—are heard, but honest people, good people who have got a very good case—my Hon'ble friend said that the Ex-Chief Minister of Kerala had said that there was a good case for Kasargod—are ignored. They had not the courtesy to mention Kasargod.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—The difficulty appears to be that the Chief Minister of the Bombay State is backing the case of Maharashtrians, but here, unfortunately, for Kasargod and other places, there is no Chief Minister to back.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—Where there is force, where there is pressure, where there is loud voice, people give a patient hearing. The people of Kasargod or Madaksira or other areas might prevail upon the people at Delhi. They might put pressure, unjustly, on the Chief Minister or the Government of Mysore to change the boundaries but if they put pressure to change the boundaries of only Mysore and Bombay, they will be unjust. But that is the consideration which may pervail because it has prevailed with this State. Sir, I wish to admimister a warning, a mild warning to the Government.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Why mild, Sir?

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—It harms no one. Sir, I wish to administer a warning. They have gone into these considerations, considerations not germane to the issue. You are showing signs of submission to pressure. I do not wish to use strong words—loud noise, the voice of agitation and give way to certain sections. That is an incentive to other areas also to gain their objects by this method. In other areas also people would be free to begin agitation because they have a very good case. So that that should not be the consideration at all for redrawing the boundaries in any area.

Now, Sir, I do not know why certain phrases have been used in the resolution that minor adjustments agreed to by the States concerned also be carried out. We have not been given to understand what the minor adjustment will be. I know there are certain criteria evolved by the States Reorganisation Commission for drawing the boundaries. The criteria are thrown over-board at a later stage and by agreement, certain other criteria were evolved. What is this 'minor adjustment'? It has not been made clear, as to whether district will be made the unit, whether taluk will be made the unit or hobli or the village. It is very difficult to say. If according to Pataskar formula......

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—There is no reference as to unit. It is a matter to be agreed to by the two States concerned.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—According to my friend, minor may be major at some stage! Provided both the States agree, there may be any adjustment.

Sir, if you take, according to the Pataskar award, that every village in the State is to be taken into consideration and the matter decided, it may result in an interminable enquiry and it may never end at all. I do state that it cannot be taken and I am not for it. because you do not know where it will end. But I submit that this question has to be decided some time or other and the sooner the better. We are all agreed that we have got a more important task of building the nation, building the State and if this argument of linguistic conflict goes on for ever and ever, when are we to build the State? When are we going to build the district of Belgaum, Kasargod and other disputed areas? There must be an end at some time. Therefore, I wish to suggest to the Government, Sir that the Government or the Hon'ble the Chief Minister who will be going to Delhi may be firm on the matter and say that if the Government of India wish to rake up this matter of boundaries at all,—if the Government of India say that they are not going to touch the boundary question at all, we cannot help it—woe be to the people who are suffering in other areas! But in case they are going to rake up this matter, as some of my friends like Sri V. S. Patil stated, let all the parties to the case, the States of Bombay, Mysore and the Government of India sit together. Because it is not only the two States which can settle. Unless there are these three parties coming together, we cannot possibly arrive at any settlement. Similarly, in regard to Kerala also, let the States concerned and the Government of India sit together. There is no logical end to this dispute at all. If anybody can dare say that this can be justly solved to the satisfaction of all the parties, it can never be done. Some arbitration method has to be decided upon and the boundary drawn. That has to be done and both parties must agree to abide by this. It depends upon the goodwill of both sides—the State of Bombay and the State of Mysore. Sir, in addition to this, some politics also play here. I find my Hon'ble friend Sri Narasimhan made mention of the Chief Minister of Bombay. I am not going to condemn anybody or say anything disparaging. Till now the Congress Party in Bombay did not take part in this agitation. They even said that it was not the method of deciding the boundaries at all. They made it clear. If I remember aright, the Hon'ble the Chief Minister of Bombay also made it clear that he deprecated certain methods adopted by certain sections of the people in Bombay.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—You are mistaken. The Chief Minister condemned only when it came to a question of strike in Bombay.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.–But the methods adopted, he did not approve of. He made it abundantly clear in Bombay that he did not support the methods adopted in order to bring about the changes in the boundaries. Now, of course, there is a change of approach after the bifurcation of the Bombay State has been decided. That is a political move. After the bifurcation of Bombay, he must have the support of the Maharashtrians; in a bi-lingual State of Bombay, he gets the support of Gujarathis. He must now bank upon the support of Maharashtrians to maintain his position or to run the Congress Government or even if the Congress should get a majority in the next elections. So, although the Chief Minister had a different approach to this question before, now after the decision was taken to bifurcate the State of Bombay, he has changed the approach to this question.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Even according to the demand made by the Maharashtrians, may I know the number of members that are going to come from Bombay area who will give support to Sri Chavan ?

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—That is not the point here. Sri Chavan wants the support of the Maharashtrians, the M.E.S. and the people of Maharashtra as a whole now in the initial stages. That is why he has changed his approach.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—I do not exactly remember whether the Hon'ble the ex-Chief Minister of Kerala agreed for giving certain parts to the Mysore State, Was it your impression that he agreed ?

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—Yes.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—That is why I wanted to give this information. After I became the Chief Minister, there was only one occasion to meet the ex-Chief Minister of Kerala in his own capital. At that time, there was a meeting of the Zonal Council and informally we discussed it and he denied it. He did not agree. But I do not know why this impression is there in the mind... .....

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—I happened to be a member of the Zonal Council when we took up this question specifically. He said: 'I am quite prepared, but the Congress Committee is in the way.' This is exactly what he said. Those were the very words he uttered in our presence, myself and Sri Nijalingappa. He said 'I am quite prepared to give the territory south of Chandragiri River'; but, he said 'the Congress Committee is in the way'. Now of course, he might have changed his view.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—What the Hon'ble Member says may be quite correct, Sir. My meeting with him was later. He said at that time. "We are not prepared to consider that today, because it involves some political issue".

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—Sir, that is political because, I know when he came to Mangalore—I was not there—he was said to have made a categorical statement that he had no objection to cede Kasargod beyond Chandragiri river to Mysore. But when his attention was drawn to this later, he has categorically denied.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—When I met him, he denied.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—Politicians make certain statements. He had first admitted the claim. Later he denied the same. That is the way things happen. The Chief Minister of Kerala had made certain statements for political purposes. The Bombay Chief Minister is also making his political moves. We are not here concerned about political moves. Though they admit in private that a case is good, publicly they have to dance to other's tunes. That is what is happening in Bombay with regard to the Chief Minister of Bombay.

I do not want to delve deep into the history of that area, whether they belong to Karnataka or Andhra or Kerala or Madras. That is practically admitted. I wish to make it clear that with all my differences with the Congress Government, the members on

(SRI V. SRINIVASA SHETTY)

the other side and the Cabinet, I am for ceding any territory when an overwhelming majority of people do not want to stay or belong to that State. Peaceful agitations cannot be ruled out in any case, when a certain number of persons hold that a certain act either of the Central Government or of the State Government is bad. Mahatma Gandhi has said again and again that peaceful agitation is the only method. I have not gone to Belgaum and studied the situation. I am not here to support either because, I do not know whether my friends in Bombay have taken law into their own hands and committed excesses. If they have done that I unhesitatingly condemn that attitude. If the allegation that the Police have committed excesses as alleged in this House is correct, that they have gone out of their way to harass and take property by force, I unhesitatingly condemn that also. We cannot tolerate the excess committed either by the people or by the Government. The Government cannot rule by excesses. With these few words with my clearest conscience, I wish to support the move of the Government that this question must be solved peacefully and not by force. It must be done peacefully by all the three parties sitting together. I wish all success to the Chief Minister in the move. I request him to be firm in the matter—not to give way if he is not willing to give way to force. Let him not also yield to force at Delhi. It is just possible the Prime Minister of India or the Home Minister of India—if they put some pressure......

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—That can never be done. Mysore can take care of itself.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—Let him not yield to pressure. We, as representatives, here request him not to yield to pressure from any side, but to come to just conclusions.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಕೊಲ್ಲೂರು ಮಲ್ಲಪ್ಪ (ಸಿರಮ್).—ಸಭಾಪತಿಗಳೆ, ಪ್ರಾಂತ ಪುನರ್ವಿಂಗಡಣೆಯಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ಬಾರ್ಡರ್ ಅಥವಾ ಗಡಿಯ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಶ್ರೀ ವೀರಣ್ಣಗೌಡರು ಮತ್ತು ಶ್ರೀ ನಿಜಲಿಂಗಪ್ಪನವರು ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ; ಬಹಳ ಸಂತೋಷ. ಇಂಥ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ಗಡಿಯ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದೇ ಸಮನಾಗಿ ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಕ್ಯಾಂಪೇಯ್ನ್ ಮೈಸೂರಿನ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಮೊನ್ನೆ ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಯವರು ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಮೆಮೊರ್ಯಾಂಡಂ ಕೂಡ ಒಪ್ಪಿಸಿದರೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದು ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಮರಾಠಿ ಜನರಿರುವ 814 ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳು (ಇವುಗಳ ಜನ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 4,51,844) ಮೈಸೂರು ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿವೆ ; ಇವು ತಮಗೆ ಬರಬೇಕೆಂದೂ, ಹಾಗು ಈಗ ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿರುವ ಕನ್ನಡ ಮಾತನಾಡುವ 2,05,545 ಜನ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಇರುವ 260 ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳು ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕಕ್ಕೆ ಅಥವಾ ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೆಹೋಗಬೇಕೆಂದೂ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಒಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಾಂತಪುನರ್ವಿಂಗಡಣೆಯಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಭಾಗ ವಿವಾದಾಸ್ಪದವಾಗಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ದುರ್ದೈವ ವಶಾತ್ ಅವರು ಇದನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕದ ಭಾಗ ಯಾವುದು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಉಳಿದಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನೂ ಸಹ ಅವರು ತೋರಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಿಜವಾದ ಅಂಕಿ ಅಂಶಗಳು ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಚವಾನ್ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸಿಕ್ಕಿಲ್ಲವೋ ಏನೋ ಎನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ತಾವು ನ್ಯಾಯಪರರು ಎಂದು ತೋರಿಸಲು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟುಭಾಗ ಬರಬೇಕು ಮತ್ತು ಅಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟುಭಾಗ ಹೋಗಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ, ಉದಾರ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಿಂದ ತೋರಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ದೇಶದ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಹುಟ್ಟಲಿ ಎಂಬ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ, ಈ ದೇಶದ ಜನರಿಗೆ ತಪ್ಪು ತಿಳವಳಿಕೆ ಬರುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದು ಅವರ ಮೆಮೊರ್ಯಾಂಡಮ್ಮಿನಿಂದ ಕಂಡುಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಹೈದರಾಬಾದು ಭಾಗದಿಂದ ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೆ ಬರುವುದೇನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ, ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಹುಮನಾಬಾದು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನ 28 ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳು, ಭಾಲ್ಕಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನ 49 ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳು, ಸಂತಪುರ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನ 69 ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳೂ ಹಾಗೂ ಅಲಂದ್ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಬರತಕ್ಕದ್ದಿವೆ ಎಂದು ತಮ್ಮ ಮೆಮೊರ್ಯಾಂಡಮಿನಲ್ಲಿ ತೋರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಅಂಕಿ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ನೋಡಿದಿದ್ದರೆ, ಈಗ ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿರುವ ತುಳಜಾಪೂರ್, ಉಮರಗ, ದೇಗಲೂರು, ಉದಗಿರ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಬೇಕಾದ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳಿವೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತಿತ್ತು. ದುರ್ದೈವದಿಂದ ಅವರು ದೇಶದ ಎದುರಿಗೆ ತೋರಿಕೆಗಾಗಿ ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಬೇಕಾದುವು ಇಷ್ಟು ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳೆಂದು ತಮ್ಮ ಮೆಮೊರಾಂಡಮಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೂ ಅವರು ಅಂಕಿ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳದೆ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂಬುದು ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಒಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಮೆಮೊರ್ಯಾಂಡಮ್ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಾಗಿದೆ.

12-30 P.M.

ಈ ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳು ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುತ್ತವೆ ಎಂಬ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಅವರು ತೋರಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದು ಹೇಗೆ ಬಂತು, ಎಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಬಂತು, ಈ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯದ ಹಿನ್ನಲೆ ಏನಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ನಾವು ನೋಡಬೇಕು. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ನಿಜಲಿಂಗಪ್ಪನವರು ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಬಹಳ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಲೋಕಮಾನ್ಯ ತಿಲಕರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಶ್ರೀ ನರಸಿಂಹ ಚಿಂತಾಮಣಿ ಕೇಳಕರ

ಎನ್ನುವವರು ಒಬ್ಬ ಮಹಾನಾಯಕರು ಇದ್ದರು. ಯಾರ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ವರ್ತಮಾನಪತ್ರಗಳೇ ಇದ್ದಿಲ್ಲವೋ ಅಂಥ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಸರಿ ಎಂಬ ಪ್ರಸಿದ್ಧ ಮರಾಠಿ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಿ ಅದರ ಸಂಪಾದಕರು ಅವರು ಆಗಿದ್ದರು. ಅವರು ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಸಿದ್ಧರಾದ ನಾಯಕರಾಗಿದ್ದರು. ಅಂಥ ಶ್ರೀ ಕೇಳಕರ ಅವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕ ಒಂದು ಅವಾರ್ಡು ಇದೆ. ಅವಕ್ಕೆ ಕೇಳಕರ ಅವಾರ್ಡು ಎಂದು ಹೆಸರು. ಈ ಪ್ರಸಿದ್ಧವಾದ ಕೇಳಕರ ಅವಾರ್ಡ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹಳ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ತೋರಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದೇನೆಂದರೆ ಈ ಭಾಗವು ಯಾವ ಪ್ರಾಂತದ್ದಾಗಿದೆ, ಯಾವ ಪ್ರಾಂತಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಅವರು ಈ ಅವಾರ್ಡು ಕೊಡುವಾಗ್ಗೆ, ಇಂದಿನ ದಿವಸ ಇರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಯಾವುದೇ ಪ್ರಚೋದನೆ ಅಂದು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಎದ್ದಿರತಕ್ಕಂತ ಭಾಷೆಯ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಉದ್ರೇಕಗೊಂಡ ವಾತಾವರಣ ಯಾವುದೂ ಇದ್ದಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಮನಸ್ಸು ಕೆಡಿಸುವಂಥ ಅಜಿಟೇಶನ್ ಅಂದರೆ ಚಳವಳಿ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಕಾಲ ಅದು ಆಗಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಂಥ ಸನ್ನಿವೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಥ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಪ್ರದೇಶ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಭಾಷೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಿದ್ದು, ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಭಾಗವು ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇರಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದು ಹೇಳಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕನುಸಾರವಾಗಿ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗಳೂ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗಳೂ ರಚಿಸಲ್ಪಟ್ಟುವು. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಗುಣವಾಗಿ ಬೆಳಗಾವ್ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಭಾಗವೆಂದು ಬಹಳ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾದ ಶಬ್ದಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ತೋರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ಕಾಲದಿಂದ ಅದು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪ್ರದೇಶ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯು ಆಡಳಿತದ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಇದೆ. ಆ ಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾರೊಬ್ಬರಾದರು ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದಿಂದ ಬಂದು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೂ ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ, ಬೆಳಗಾವ್ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟು ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಯಾರೂ ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಆ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಚಕಾರ ಶಬ್ದವನ್ನು ಸಹ ಯಾರೂ ತೆಗೆಯಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಬಿದರ್ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯು ಆಗಿನಿಂದಲೂ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೆಂದು ಗೊತ್ತುಮಾಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಬೀದರ್ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಎರಡು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳು ಮಾತ್ರ ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಆಗಿನ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಗೊತ್ತಾಯಿತು. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳನ್ನು ವಿಭಾಗ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ್ಗೆ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ಬಹಳ ಸೂಕ್ಷ್ಮವಾಗಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ದೀರ್ಘವಾಗಿ ಆಲೋಚನೆಮಾಡಿ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಯಾವ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಗೊತ್ತುಮಾಡಲಾಯಿತು. ಅದಕ್ಕನುಸಾರವಾಗಿ ಬೀದರ್ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಉಳಿದರೂ ಸಹ ಈ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಎರಡು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಲಾಯಿತು. ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಇದು ಅಂದಿನಿಂದ ಇಂದಿನವರೆಗೆ ನಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಹಿನ್ನೆಲೆಯನ್ನು ನಾವು ವಿಚಾರಮಾಡಿ ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪ್ರದೇಶ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯ ಆಡಳಿತದ ಕೈ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಬಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಎಲ್ಲ ಪ್ರದೇಶವೂ ಕನ್ನಡವಿದ್ದು ಅದು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕದ್ದಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಸಂಶಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಆಗ್ಗೆ ವಿಭಾಗಿಸಿದ್ದು ನಿರ್ವಿವಾದವಾಗಿದೆ. ಹೈದರಾಬಾದ್ ಭಾಗದ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಈಗ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ನಿಮಗೆಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಬಹಳ ಆಶ್ಚರ್ಯವಾಗಬಹುದು. ಗುಲಬರ್ಗಾ ಮತ್ತು ರಾಯಚೂರು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗಳ ಕೆಲವೊಂದು ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಇಂದಿಗೂ ಸಹ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರಸ್ಥನು ತನ್ನ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರದ ಲೆಕ್ಕ ಪತ್ರಗಳನ್ನು, ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬ ಶ್ಯಾನುಭೋಗ ಗೌಡರು ತಮ್ಮ ಹಳ್ಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಕಾಗದ ಪತ್ರಗಳನ್ನು ಅವರು ಯಾವಲಿಪಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೆದಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಬೇಕು. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ವಿ. ಎಸ್. ಪಾಟೀಲರು ಹೇಳತಕ್ಕ ಮರಾಠಿ ಭಾಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅವು ಇರದೆ, ಮೋಡೀ ಲಿಪಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೆಯಲ್ಪಟ್ಟದ್ದಾಗಿವೆ. ಪೇಶ್ವೆಯವರ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಒತ್ತಾಯದಿಂದ ಹೇರಲ್ಪಟ್ಟ ಈ ಮೋಡಿ ಲಿಪಿಯಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಸಹ ಅವರು ಬರೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆಗಿನ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಪೇಶ್ವೆ ಸರಕಾರದ ರಾಜ್ಯಾಡಳಿತವು ಆ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಿತು ಮತ್ತು ಅವರ ಆಡಳಿತದ ಭಾಷೆ ಲಿಪಿ ಬಲವಂತದಿಂದ ಹೇರಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ಮರಾಠಿ ಭಾಷೆಯು ಪ್ರಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿತು. ಈ ಪ್ರದೇಶದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ಅಂದರೆ 1956ರಲ್ಲಿ ಅದಕ್ಕೂ ಪೂರ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂದರೆ 1948ರಲ್ಲಿ ಹೈದರಾಬಾದಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾಗಿದ್ದ ಶ್ರೀ ಶೇಷಾದ್ರಿಯವರು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಈ ಪ್ರದೇವು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಭಾಗಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಮತ್ತು ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದ ಗಡಿ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಗುಲಬರ್ಗಾ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಏನಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಕೆಲವು ಜನರು ಮುಂದೆ ಬಂದು ಈ ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳು ಈ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿರ ಕೂಡದು ; ಆ ರಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದೆಲ್ಲಾ ಈಗ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವುದು States Reorganisation Act ಪಾಸ್ ಆಗಿ ಅದು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಬಂದು, ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಯಕ್ಕನುಸಾರವಾಗಿ ವಿಭಾಗ ಮಾಡಿದ ನಂತರ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಅವರು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈಗ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಹೇಳುವುದರ ಉದ್ದೇಶವೇನಿದೆ, ಅದರ ಹಿನ್ನೆಲೆ ಏನಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ನಾವು ವಿಚಾರಮಾಡಿ ನೋಡಬೇಕು. ಇದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈ ವಿಷಯದ ಮೇಲೆಯೇ ಸಂಯುಕ್ತ ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ಸಮಿತಿಯು ಜನ್ಮತಾಳಿದೆ. ಈ ಸಮಿತಿಯು ಹುಟ್ಟಿದ್ದು ಇದರ ಮೇಲೆ. ಈ ಭಾಷೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಉದ್ರೇಕಗೊಂಡು, ಪ್ರಚೋದನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಈ ಸಮಿತಿ ಎಂಬ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆಮಾಡಿ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಏನೇನೋ ಹೇಳಿಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಭಾಗ ನಮ್ಮದು, ಆ ಭಾಗ ನಮ್ಮದು ಎಂದು ಪ್ರಚಾರ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಹೋರಾಟ ನಡೆಸಿ ಚಳವಳಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ಈ ಪ್ರದೇಶವು ಯಾರದು ಯಾರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಆಶ್ಚರ್ಯವಾಗಬಹುದು. ಹೈದರಾಬಾದಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಭಾಗವು ಮರಾಠವಾಡಾ ಆಗಿದೆ, ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕು, ಯಾವುದು ಆಂಧ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕು, ಯಾವುದು ತೆಲಂಗಾಣವಾಗಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿದ್ದ ಸರಕಾರ ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಟಿಸ್ಟಿಕ್ಸ್ ತಯಾರು ಮಾಡಿತು. ಯಾವ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಕನ್ನಡವಿದೆ, ಯಾವುದು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕು, ಅದರಂತೆ ಮರಾಠಿ ಪ್ರದೇಶ ಯಾವುದು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ, ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ಗ್ರೂಪ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಅವರಿಂದ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಮಾಡಿಸಿ ಅಂಕಿ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಗಳ ಆಧಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಈ ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರು ಪ್ರಚೋದನೆ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಕೊಲ್ಲೂರು ಮಲ್ಲಪ್ಪ)

ಮಾಡಿ ಈ ಪ್ರದೇಶ ತಮಗೆ ಬರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವ 28 ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ 24 ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳ ಅಂಕಿ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಮಾಡಿ ನೋಡಿದರೆ--ನಾನು ಈ ಅಂಕಿ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಬಲ್ಲೆನು—ಈ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕನ್ನಡ ಮಾತನಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥವರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಈ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕದ್ದೆಂದು ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಸಂಬಂಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ರೆಜಲ್ಯೂಷನ್ ಕೂಡ ಪಾಸ್ ಆಯಿತು. ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯವು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿದೆಯೇ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯವರು, ಉಳಿದ ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು, ರೂಲಿಂಗ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯವರು, ಡಿ.ಸಿ.ಸಿ. ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಕುಳಿತು ಎಂಟು ದಿವಸಗಳವರೆಗೆ ದೀರ್ಘವಾಗಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡಿದರು. ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಕುಳಿತು ಸುದೀರ್ಘವಾಗಿ ಆಳವಾಗಿ ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡಿ ಒಮ್ಮತದಿಂದ ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯಮಾಡಿದರು. ಅನಂತರ ಈ ರಿಆರ್ಗನೈಜೇಷನ್ ಆಯಿತು. ಕನ್ನಡ ಮಾತನಾಡುವ ಕೆಲವು ಭಾಗಗಳನ್ನು ಆಂಧ್ರದಿಂದ ತೆಗೆದು ಹಾಕಿ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಈಗ ಮಾತ್ರ ಹೊರಗಿನಿಂದ ಬೇರೆ ರಾಜ್ಯದಿಂದ ಜನಗಳು ಬಂದು ಈ ಚಳವಳಿ ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಾ ಇಷ್ಟು ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳು ಬರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ ವಿನಾ ಅಲ್ಲಿಯ ಜನರು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ವಾಸಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಪ್ರಜೆಗಳು ಯಾರೂ ಅವರ ಹಾಗೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಲ್ಲಿಯ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಸಂಬಂಧವಿಲ್ಲವೇ? ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಹೊರಗಿನಿಂದ ಬಂದು ಎಲ್ಲಿಯೋ ಒಂದು ಊರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡು ಒಂದು ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿಕೊಂಡು, ಲಕ್ಷಾವಧಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಶೇಖರಿಸಿ, ಅದನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಿ, ಅವರ ಒಳಗಿನ ದುರುದ್ದೇಶಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲದೇ ಇರುವ ಮೂಕ ನಿರುಪದ್ರವಿ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಏನೇನೋ ಹೇಳಿ ತಪ್ಪು ಕಲ್ಪನೆ ಉಂಟುಮಾಡುವ ಪ್ರಚೋದನೆಯನ್ನು ಈ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವರು. ಇಂಥ ಕಾರ್ಯದಿಂದ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವುದೇ ರೀತಿಯಿಂದ ಕಲ್ಯಾಣವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಸರಿಯಾದ ಮಾರ್ಗ ತೋರಿಸುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಜನರಿಗೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಗಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಅವರಿಗಿಲ್ಲ. ತಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಹಿತಸಾಧನೆಗಾಗಿ, ವೈಯಕ್ತಿಕವಾಗಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಹಿತ ಮತ್ತು ಪ್ರತಿಷ್ಠೆಗಾಗಿ, ಅಜ್ಞರಾದ ಮೂಕರಾದ ಜನರಲ್ಲಿ ಅಪಪ್ರಚಾರ ಮಾಡಿ ಸ್ವಾರ್ಥಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಗುಂಡಾಯಿಸಂ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಒಂದು ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಸಾಧನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಒಂದು ಉಚ್ಚಧ್ಯೇಯ ನೀತಿಯಿಲ್ಲದ ಇಂಥ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಕೆಲಸ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮುಂಬಯಿ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಚವ್ಹಾಣರವರು ಸಮರ್ಥಿಸಿ ಬೆಂಬಲ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಬಹಳ ವಿಷಾದದ ಸಂಗತಿಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದು ಸರಿಯಾದದ್ದಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಬಹಳ ಶಾಂತ ರೀತಿಯಿಂದ ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳು ಇವು. ಇವೊತ್ತು ಅಂಕಿ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಅವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಟ್ಟದ್ದನ್ನೂ ನಾವು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದನ್ನೂ ಎರಡನ್ನೂ ವಿಚಾರಮಾಡಿ ನೋಡಲು ನಮ್ಮಿಂದ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಜೋನಲ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತು, ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡು, ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ಕಮಿಟಿ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಲು ಒಪ್ಪಿ ಎರಡು ಹೆಸರುಗಳನ್ನು ಸೂಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಕಮಿಟಿಯನ್ನು ಸಹ ನೇಮಕಮಾಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಸಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಅವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದು ಬಿಟ್ಟು, ಇವೊತ್ತು ಮೆಮೋರ್ಯಾಂಡಂ ಕೊಟ್ಟು, ನಮಗೆ ಪಾಟಸ್ಕರ್ ಅವಾರ್ಡಿನಂತೆ ಆಗಬೇಕು, ವಿಲೇಜ್ ಯೂನಿಟ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು, ಕಂಟಿನ್ಯೂಟಿಬೇಕು, ಲ್ಯಾಂಗ್ವೇಜ್ ಬೇಸಿಸ್ ಮೇಲೆ ನಿರ್ಧಾರ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವಂತಹ slogan ಏನಿವೆ ಅದನ್ನು ವಿಚಾರಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇ ಆದರೆ ಪಾಟಸ್ಕರ್ ಅವಾರ್ಡಿಗೂ, ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೂ ಏನು ಸಂಬಂಧವಿದೆ? ಪಾಟಸ್ಕರ್ ಅವಾರ್ಡ್ ಎಲ್ಲಿ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಮದರಾಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ತಮಿಳರು ಮತ್ತು ಆಂಧ್ರರು ಒಂದೇ ಪ್ರಾಂತದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದರು, ಅದು ಎರಡು ಪ್ರಾಂತವಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಸಾರಿ ಅವರು ಕಲೆತು ವಿಚಾರ ವಿನಿಮಯ ಮಾಡಿ ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದರು. ಅದರ ಸಲುವಾಗಿ ಪಾಟಸ್ಕರ್ ಅವಾರ್ಡ್ ಬಂತೇ ಹೊರತು ಮತ್ತೆ ಯಾವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಅಲ್ಲ. ಲ್ಯಾಂಗ್ವೇಜ್ ಬೇಸಿಸ್ ಮೇಲೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ ರಾಯಚೂರು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಇದೆ, ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ 40-50 ಹಳ್ಳಿ ಆಂಧ್ರದವರಿಗೆ ಸಿಕ್ಕಬಹುದು. ಇದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸೇರಿಸಿದರೆ ಅವರದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಪ್ರಾಂತವಾಗಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ಕಮ್ಯೂನಿಕೇಷನ್ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ, ವ್ಯಾಪಾರದ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ರಾಯಚೂರಿಗೆ ಬರಲೇಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈಗ ಬೆಳಗಾಂ ವಿಷಯ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ, ನನಗಿಂತಲೂ ವಿಶೇಷವಾಗಿ ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾದ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸುವಂಥ ಜನರು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಒಂದು ತತ್ವದ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ. ಬೆಳಗಾಂವಿಗೆ ಬರತಕ್ಕ ಧಾನ್ಯ, ವ್ಯಾಪಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬರತಕ್ಕ ಸಾಮಾನುಗಳು ಇವೆಲ್ಲಾ ಎಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಬೆಳಗಾಮಿಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತವೆ? ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಕಂಟಿಗ್ಯುಯಿಟಿ ಇದೆ, ಮರಾಠಿಮಾತನಾಡುವವರು ಇದ್ದಾರೆ; ಅದರ ಸಲುವಾಗಿ ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಡಿರಿ ಎಂದರೆ ಹೇಗೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ? ಆ ರೀತಿ ವಾದದ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ವಾದ ಮಾಡುತ್ತ ಕುಳಿತರೆ ನನಗೂ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಇದೆ; ಚವ್ಹಾನ್ ಸಾಹೇಬರಿಗೆ ಏನೂ ಆಗಲಿಕ್ಕಿಲ್ಲ. ರಾಜಕೀಯದ ಸಲುವಾಗಿ ಬೆಳಗಾಂವಿಯನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ವಿನಂತಿಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಮಾಡಿರುವುದು ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಶ್ಲಾಘನೀಯವಾದುದು. ಅವರು ಬಿಚ್ಚು ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಿಂದ ಮುಂದುವರಿಯುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ವಿ. ಎಸ್. ಪಾಟೀಲ್ ಅವರು Pockets ಕೊಡುವ ಸಲುವಾಗಿ ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಇದ್ದಾರೆ ಮತ್ತು ಅವರು ಮಾಡಿದಂಥ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ಇದ್ದಾರೆ, ಅವರಿಗೆ ಬಿಟ್ಟುಬಿಡೋಣ. ಶಾಂತವಾತಾವರಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತು ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು, ಜನರ ಮೇಲೆ ಅತ್ಯಾಚಾರ ನಡೆಸುವುದು, ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹಗಲು, ರಾತ್ರಿ, ಮೈಸೂರಿನ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಿ ಒಂದೇ ಸಮನೆ ಅಪಪ್ರಚಾರ ನಡೆಸುವುದು, ಇಲ್ಲಿನ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಬಂದ ಹಾಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದುದು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿವೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಈ ಗಡಿಯ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಚೈನಾ ಬಾರ್ಡರ್ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಆದ ಹಾಗೆ ಆಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಚೈನಾದ ಪ್ರೈಮ್ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರೂ ಸಹ ಇಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಬಂದು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ, ಕಹಿವಾತಾವರಣವನ್ನುಂಟು ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಷ್ಟು ಪ್ರಾಮು

ಖ್ಯತೆಕೊಡಬಾರದು. ನೋಡುವವರಿಗೂ, ಕೇಳುವವರಿಗೂ, ಇದೇನು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಆಗುತ್ತಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಆಗಬಾರದು. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ವಿ. ಎಸ್. ಪಾಟೀಲ್ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಗ್ರೂಪ್ ಪಾಲಿಟಿಕ್ಸ್ ಇದೆ, ಇದು ದೇಶದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಆಗಿರಬಹುದು; ಆದರೆ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಜಕೀಯವನ್ನೇಕೆ ತರಬೇಕು? ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಿರಬಹುದು. ಓಟಿನ ವಿಷಯ ಹೇಳಿದರು, ಇಷ್ಟು ಓಟು ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ಓಟು ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದವರಿಗೆ, ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರು ಎಂದು. ಅದೇ ಬೇಸಿಸ್ ಮೇಲೆ ಮುಂದೂ ಕೂಡ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಾರೆಯೋ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ. ಯಾವುದೇ ವಿಷಯ ಆಗಲಿ ಹಿಂದಿನ ಹಿನ್ನೆಲೆಯಿಂದ ಮುಂದೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕು. ಗ್ರೂಪ್ ಪಾಲಿಟಿಕ್ಸ್ ಮೇಲೆ ಜನರು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಅವರ ಸಲುವಾಗಿ ಬಾರ್ಡರ್ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಮಾಡಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಕುಳಿತರೆ ಯಾವ ಕೊನೆಯನ್ನೂ ಮುಟ್ಟಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಆ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ, ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟಿನವರು ಕೂಲಂಕಷವಾಗಿ ವಿಚಾರಮಾಡಿ, ನಿರ್ಣಯಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದು ಒಂದು ಕಾನೂನು ಮಾಡಿ ಆ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಪ್ರಾಂತಗಳನ್ನು ವಿಂಗಡನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಾಗಿರುವಾಗ No-tax Campaign ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಜನರ ಬೇಡಿಕೆ ನೆರವೇರಿದಂತಾಗುತ್ತದೇನು? ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಾದರೂ ಈ ವಾತಾವರಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಲಿಕ್ಕೂ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ.

ಇಂಥ ವಾತಾವರಣವನ್ನು ಉತ್ಪನ್ನ ಮಾಡಿ ದೇಶದ ಬಾರ್ಡರ್ ವಿಷಯಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೋದರೆ ಏನೂ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಇದೆ. ಈ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಿ ಮರಾಠಿ ಸ್ಪೀಕಿಂಗ್ ಜನರು ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೋ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಬೇಡಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಮಾಡುವ ಕೆಲಸದಿಂದ ಶಾಂತತೆಯನ್ನು ಉತ್ಪನ್ನಮಾಡಲಿಕ್ಕಿಲ್ಲ. ಯಾವ ವಿಷಯ ಅವರಿಗೆ ತಕ್ಕಂತೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಅವರು ಏನಾದರೂ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಸರಿಯಾದ ದಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಲಿ. ಈಗ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡಿಸಿರುವ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪವನ್ನು ನಾನು ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ ಮತ್ತು ಸಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—On Monday also we will take up the discussion on this motion. The House will now rise and meet on Monday, the 14th March 1960 at 1 P.M.

The House adjourned at Fifty Minutes past Twelve of the Clock to meet again at One of the Clock on Monday, the 14th March 1960.